

## Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā: The Purāṇatīkās and the Tīkās on the Four Nikāyas

In Pāli bibliographical sources<sup>1</sup> the *tīkās*<sup>2</sup> on the first four *nikāyas* are mentioned either:

(a) as two — more or less complete — different sets:

(1) the old set of four *purāṇatīkās* with a common name Līnatthapakāsinī:

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-purāṇatīkā, Paṭhamā Līnatthapakāsinī;

Papañcasūdanī-purāṇatīkā, Dutiyā Līnatthapakāsinī;

Sāratthapakāsinī-purāṇatīkā, Tatiyā Līnatthapakāsinī;

Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇatīkā, Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī; and

(2) the later set of four *tīkās* with a common name Sāratthamañjūsā:

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-tīkā, Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsā;

Papañcasūdanī-tīkā, Dutiyā Sāratthamañjūsā;

Sāratthapakāsinī-tīkā, Tatiyā Sāratthamañjūsā;

Manorathapūraṇī-tīkā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā; or

(b) as a single set in which the first three *tīkās* are from the old set and are called Līnatthapakāsinī (see (a-1) above) and the fourth *tīkā* is from the later set and is called Sāratthamañjūsā (see (a-2) above), that is:

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-purāṇatīkā, Paṭhamā Līnatthapakāsinī;

Papañcasūdanī-purāṇatīkā, Dutiyā Līnatthapakāsinī;

Sāratthapakāsinī-purāṇatīkā, Tatiyā Līnatthapakāsinī;

Aṅguttaranikāya-tīkā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā.

---

I presented an earlier version of Part I of this article at the XIth World Sanskrit Conference, Torino, in April 2000.

<sup>1</sup>The following bibliographic sources will be discussed: Saddhamma-s, Pagan inscription (see G.H. Luce and Tim Hway, 1976; *PLB*, pp. 102–109), Gv, Sās, Sās-dīp, Piṭ-sm, and CPD.

<sup>2</sup>For the etymology of the word *tīkā* see Mayrhofer, *EWA* s.v. See also *PLC*, pp. 192–93; *PL*, pp. 148–51; Bollée, pp. 824–35; *HPL*, pp. 100–101.

The authorship of the *purāṇatikās* (called Līnatthapakāsinī) is usually ascribed to Dhammapāla<sup>3</sup> and that of the later *tikās* (called Sāratthamañjūsā) is ascribed to Sāriputta of Polonnaruva.<sup>4</sup> Although according to some catalogues<sup>5</sup> of Pāli manuscripts held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka, both sets of *tikās* exist in manuscript form, only the *tikās* belonging to the single set (b) have been published and the remaining ones belonging to the two sets (a) seem to have been ignored.

This discussion of the *tikās* on the four *nikāyas* will be presented in two parts. In Part I, I will discuss printed editions and manuscripts of the *nikāya-tikās* — with emphasis on Burmese and Sinhala manuscripts which have not yet been explored. In addition, I will discuss the possibility of the existence of two sets of *nikāya-tikās* instead of just one, as is usually stated in works of modern Pāli scholarship. A special emphasis will be given to a recently discovered Burmese manuscript of the old Ānguttara-*tikā*, Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī (Mp-pt), which will be discussed in more detail and will provide a completely new perspective on the research concerning the *tikās* on the four *nikāyas*.

In Part II three parallel chapters (Ekanipāta-*tikā* III–V) from both Ānguttara-*tikās* (Mp-pt and Mp-t) will be compared and their major differences analysed in the light of the information about the *nikāya-tikās* given in Saddhamma-s. The comparison will further evidence my

<sup>3</sup>On the date(s) and works of Dhammapāla(s) see *HPL*, pp. 167–70; Buddhadatta, 1957; *BhB*, pp. 63–68; Buddhadatta 1960, pp. 54–55; Dhammaratana Thera, 1968, pp. 40–41; Sv-pt, pp. xli–lv; Bangchang, pp. xxiv–xxxix; Upās, pp. 28 foll.; Cousins, 1972, pp. 159–65; A. Pieris, 1978, pp. 61–77; *EncBuddh*, Vol. 4, fasc. 4, pp. 501–504; A.K. Warder, 1981, pp. 198–207; P. Jackson, 1990, pp. 209–11.

<sup>4</sup>On Sāriputta of Polonnaruva, see Pecenko, 1997, pp. 159–79; *HPL*, pp. 172–73.

<sup>5</sup>I would like to mention two important catalogues: (1) *LPP* and (2) *Pit-sm* (1989), a very important Burmese bibliographic work which also refers to the manuscripts held in the National Library, Rangoon. Of course, these two catalogues do not list all the Pāli manuscripts held in Burma and Sri Lanka (cf. 2.2. below).

proposition (based on the information in Saddhamma-s, see Part I, 1.1.) that two sets of *nikāya-tikās* (Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā) were most probably compiled.

## Part I: Bibliographical sources, manuscripts and printed editions

### 1. The *tikās* in Pāli bibliographical sources

#### 1.1. Saddhammasaṅgaha

Saddhammasaṅgaha (Saddhamma-s), the oldest known Pāli bibliographical reference work, was compiled in the 14th century by Dhammadikitti Mahāsāmi, who visited Ceylon and was a pupil of Dhammadikitti.<sup>6</sup> After his visit to Ceylon he “returned to his own country, reached the city of Yodaya [Ayodaya] and while staying in a great residence called Laṅkārāma built by the king named Paramarāja he wrote Saddhammasaṅgaha”.<sup>7</sup> From the colophon to Saddhamma-s it seems likely that Dhammadikitti Mahāsāmi was a Thai who wrote Saddhamma-s in the ancient Siamese kingdom Ayudhyā (Ayuthaya)<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Saddhamma-s 90, 3–8. According to K.R. Norman, Dhammadikitti was “probably one of the *sangharājas* who lived towards the end of the fourteenth century” (*PL*, p. 180). Godakumbura mentions that Dhammadikitti Mahāsāmi “received his ordination under the Dhammadīrti’s of Gadālādeniya” (1980, pp. xxxi–xxxii). See also *PLC*, p. 245; H. Bechert, 1966, p. 265; W.M. Sirisena, 1978, pp. 100–102; K.L. Hazra, 1986, pp. 69–71; *HPL*, p. 3.

Although Saddhamma-s is taken here as the oldest bibliographical work, a much earlier list of various Pāli texts from an inscription dated 1223 CE has been recently discussed by U Than Tun, 1998, pp. 37–55. Although the *tikās* on the four *nikāyas* are also listed in the inscription, it is not clear to which set — Līnatthapakāsinī or Sāratthamañjūsā or both — they belonged (see Than Tun, 1998, p. 50).

<sup>7</sup>Saddhamma-s 90, 10–14: *punāgato sakam desam sampatto 'Yodayam [= sampatto Ayodayam] puram, Paramarājābhidhānena mahārājena kārite, Laṅkārāmamahāvāse vasatā santavuttinā, Dhammadikktyorūsāminā ... racitam idam Saddhammasaṅgahan nāma sabbaso parinītīhitam.*

<sup>8</sup>This was first suggested by G. Coedès, 1915, p. 43. C.E. Godakumbura mentions the author of Saddhamma-s first as a “Siamese monk who wrote at Gadālādeniya in Ceylon during the 14th century A.D.” (1980, p. xxvii, n. 1) and a few pages later as a “thera from India who also bore the name

during the rule of king Paramarāja I (Borommoracha I, 1370–88).<sup>9</sup> Paramarāja I was “a contemporary of the [author’s teacher] Dhammadikti who lived during the reign of [the Sinhala king] Bhuvanaikabāhu V (1372–1408)”.<sup>10</sup> It is also known that the Buddhism practised in Ayudhyā at that time was the Theravāda of the Sinhala tradition.<sup>11</sup>

In Saddhamma-s two sets of *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* are mentioned: Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā. Līnatthapakāsinī was written by the *porānas*<sup>12</sup> and was a subcommentary (*atthavanṇanā*) on the *atthakathās* of the entire *tipiṭaka*.<sup>13</sup> The second set of *tīkās* on the first four *nikāyas* was called Sāratthamañjūsā and was compiled — as a part of the “new” compilation of *tīkās* on the entire canon — during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I (1153–86) by the convocation of “elders” (*therā bhikkhū*)<sup>14</sup> presided over by Diṁbulāgala Mahākassapatthera,

Dhammadikti” (p. xxxii). See also Buddhadatta, 1962, pp. 383–86.

<sup>9</sup>Wyatt, 1984, p. 312.

<sup>10</sup>Sirisena, pp. 101–102. According to Coedès, 1915, p. 43, “Il est impossible de fixer la date à laquelle ce texte fut compilé, ce nom de Paramarāja ayant été porté par plusieurs souverains d’Ayuthya.”

<sup>11</sup>EncBuddh, Vol. 2, fasc. 3, p. 474; Wyatt, pp. 61–98; Hazra, 1982, pp. 152–53.

<sup>12</sup>On *porānas* see Adikaram, EHBC, pp. 16–18; F. Lottermoser, 1982, pp. 209–13.

<sup>13</sup>Saddhamma-s 58.28–29: *piṭakattayaṭṭhakathāya līnatthappakāsanattham atthavanṇanām purānehi kataṃ*. Although in this reference the *tīkās* on the first four *nikāyas* are not listed explicitly, it seems probable that they were called Līnatthapakāsinī. H. Saddhatissa (“Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154) explains: “The *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* is also called *Līnatthappakāsinī* ... The Saddhammasaṅgha has freely used the word *atthavanṇanā* for *tīkā* and further amplified it as the *Atthavanṇanā* for the purpose of elucidating the hidden meanings (*Līnatthappakāsanattham atthavanṇanām*)”. Cf. the title of Sv-pṭ, ed. by Lily de Silva: Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā Līnatthavaṇṇanā.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Saddhamma-s 59.14–18: *atha kho therā bhikkhū ... atthavanṇanām thapesum*; 62.13: *piṭakattayaṭṭīka ca tīkācariyehi bhāsitā* (v. 7).

The date of the assembly “is tentatively fixed at A.D. 1165” (Panditha, 1973, p. 137). See also Mhv LXII 2 foll.; LXXVIII 1–30; W. Geiger, “Introduction” in Mhv Trsl., pp. 28–29; Geiger 1956, § 31 (literature), n. 4.

who was the first *saṅgharāja* in Ceylon and the most senior monk from Udumbaragirivihāra.<sup>15</sup> The entire compilation was accomplished within one year.<sup>16</sup>

While the individual *tīkās* of the first set are not explicitly mentioned, Saddhamma-s lists the four *tīkās* of the second set as follows:

tadanantaram puttantaṭīke Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sumaṅgalavilāsiniyā  
atthavaṇṇanām ārabhitvā mūlabhāsāya Māgadhiyā niruttiyā pathama-  
Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanām thapesum. tathā Majjhima-  
nikāyaṭṭhakathāya Papañcasūdaniyā ... dutiya-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma  
atthavaṇṇanām thapesum. tathā Saṃyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sārattha-  
ppakāsaniyā ... tatiya-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanām thapesum.  
tathā Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāya Manorathapūraṇiyā ... catuttha-  
Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanām thapesum.<sup>17</sup>

Saddhamma-s explains that the second set of *tīkās* (Sāratthamañjūsā) was written because the existing set (Līnatthapakāsinī) “did not serve the purpose of bhikkhus residing in different countries”,<sup>18</sup> the reason being that many *gaṇhiṇipadas* (explanatory works which dealt with difficult expressions and passages) that belonged to the old set were written in the Sinhala language and what was written in Māgadhi had

<sup>15</sup>Saddhamma-s 59, 7: *Mahākassapattherapamukham bhikkhusaṅgham*; on Mahākassapatthera of Udumbaragirivihāra; see also P. Pecenko, “Notes” in Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup>, Vol. I, pp. 106–107, n. 1,5; PLC, pp. 176–77, 192–94; DPPN s.v. Mahā Kassapa 2.; Buddhadatta, 1960, pp. 75–77; H. Bechert, 1966, Vol. I, p. 265.

<sup>16</sup>Saddhamma-s 60,25–27: *ayam piṭakatṭhakathāya atthavannanā eka-  
saṃvaccharen’ eva niṭṭhita*.

<sup>17</sup>Saddhamma-s 59.23–35; cf. Saddhamma-s 61,21–23: *piṭakattayavannanā ca  
līnatthassa pakāsanā, Sāratthadīpanī nāma Sāratthamañjūsā pi ca* (v. 18),  
*Paramatthappakāsani mahātherēhi bhāsitā, sattānam sabbabhāsānam sā  
ahosi hitāvahā* (v. 19).

<sup>18</sup>Saddhamma-s 58,30–31: *taṃ sabbam desantarāvāśīnam bhikkhūnam attham  
na sādheti*; translation by Law, 1941, p. 84. Cf. Saddhamma-s 61,9–10:  
*piṭakatṭhakathāyāham līnatthassa pakāsanam, na taṃ sabbattha bhikkhūnam  
attham sādheti sabbaso* (v. 12); also O.v. Hinüber, HPL, pp. 172–73, § 374: “... older works no longer served the purpose of the monks in the twelfth century.”

been mixed and confused with (Pāli) translations (*bhāsantara*) of the *Gaṇthipadas*.<sup>19</sup> The Līnatthapakāsinī set was nevertheless used as a basis for the new “complete and clear *atthavaṇṇanā*”,<sup>20</sup> the mistakes (“versions, translations” — *bhāsantara*) in the old *tīkās* were removed, but their essence was kept in its entirety.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup>Saddhamma-s 58,31–59,2 : *kattha ci anekesu gaṇthipadesu Sihalabhāsāya niruttiyā likhitāñ ca kattha ci mūlabhāsāya Māgadhiķāya bhāsantarena sammissam ākulāñ ca katvā likhitāñ ca.* Law’s translation, 1941, p. 84: “Some were written in many terse expressions [*gaṇthipada*] according to the grammar of the Sinhala language, some were written in the dialect of Magadha, which is the basic language, but they have been confused and twisted by translation”; cf. O.v. Hinüber, *HPL*, p. 173, § 374: “Particularly the *Gaṇthipadas* written in Sinhalese are difficult to understand (Sp-ṭ [B<sup>e</sup> 1960] I 2,5–8) and [were] therefore summarized in Pāli.” On *gaṇthipadas*, see Lily de Silva, “General Introduction” in Sv-pt, pp. xxxii–xxxviii; O.v. Hinüber, *HPL*, pp. 170–71, §§ 367–71.

See also Saddhamma-s 61, 9–20 where the state of the Līnatthapakāsinī set is described in more detail. These two passages from Saddhamma-s (14th century), especially Saddhamma-s 61,9–20, are most probably based on a very similar passage from Sp-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1960 I 2,5–16 ascribed to Sāriputta of Polonnaruva, who lived about two centuries earlier — at the time of the compilation of the Sāratthamañjūsā set.

<sup>20</sup>Saddhamma-s 59,2–3 : *mayam bhāsantaram apanetvā paripuṇṇam anākulam atthavaṇṇanām kareyyāmā ti.*

<sup>21</sup>Saddhamma-s 61,19–20 = Sp-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1960 I 2,15–16 : *bhāsantaram tato hitvā sāram ādāya sabbaso / anākulam karissāmi paripuṇṇavanicchayañ.* The introductory passages in the existing printed editions of Sv-pt E<sup>e</sup>, Ps-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961, Spk-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961, and in the recently discovered manuscript of Mp-pt (see Part I, 2.2 and Part II below), which all belong to the old Līnatthapakāsinī set, are, with the exception of minor orthographic differences, practically identical. The introduction in Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> 1996, which is the fourth (*catutthā*) *tīkā* of the later Sāratthamañjūsā set, is considerably different from Sv-pt E<sup>e</sup>, Ps-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961, Spk-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961, and the text in the manuscript of Mp-pt, and is much closer to Sp-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1960 and Sv-nt B<sup>e</sup> 1961. See P. Pecenko, “Table of Parallel Passages” in Mp-ṭ I; also H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154. For a detailed textual comparison of three parallel chapters from Mp-pt and Mp-ṭ, see Part II below.

## 1.2. The Pagan inscription

The second important source of information about the *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* is the Pagan inscription of 1442 (804 BE) inscribed in the beginning of the rule of Narapati (1442–68),<sup>22</sup> less than three centuries after Parakkamabāhu I (1153–86). The inscription gives a list of 299 manuscripts,<sup>23</sup> amongst which the *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* are also mentioned.

The titles of the *tīkās* given in this inscription are very similar to the titles given in *Pit-sm* (1989) (see 1.6 below),<sup>24</sup> which in turn are also very similar to the titles of the Chatthasaṅgāyana editions of these *tīkās*. The *tīkās* on D, M and S are listed as follows:

the *tīkā* on D has three entries: *tīgā sīlakkhandhavā dīghanikāy* (no. 44), *tīgā mahāvā dīghanikāy* (no. 45) and *tīgā pādheyayavā dīghanikāy* (no. 46);<sup>25</sup>

the *tīkā* on M also has three entries: *tīkā mūlapaṇṇāsa* (no. 53), *tīkā majhimapaṇṇāsa* (no. 54) and *tīgā upariipaṇṇāsa* (no. 55);<sup>26</sup>

and the *tīkā* on S has two entries: *tīgā sagāthavā saṇyut* (no. 63) and *tīgā kandhavaggādi saṇyut* (no. 65).<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Luce and Tin Htway, 1976, pp. 203–17; *PLB*, p. 41. Cf. also U Than Tun, 1998, pp. 37–55.

<sup>23</sup>Catalogue in Luce and Tin Htway, 1976, pp. 218–48. The *tīkās* in this article are quoted according to their numbers in the Catalogue with the same transliteration of their titles. Cf. *PLB*, pp. 102–109; Niharranjan Ray, 1946, pp. 193–95.

<sup>24</sup>Also *Pitakat-tō samuinh* or *Pitakat sumh pum cā tamh*. I consulted the edition of 1989.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 187: *Sut-sīlakkhan-tīkā hoṇh*, 189: *Sut-mahāvā-tīkā*, 190: *Sut-pātheyya-tīkā*; Sv-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I: *Sīlakkhandhavagga-tīkā*, II: *Mahāvagga-tīkā*, III: *Pāthikavagga-tīkā*.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) 191: *Mūlapaṇṇāsa-tīkā*, 192: *Majhimapaṇṇāsa-tīkā*, 193: *Uparipaṇṇāsa-tīkā*; Ps-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I–II: *Mūlapaṇṇāsa-tīkā*, III: *Majhimapaṇṇāsa-tīkā* and *Uparipaṇṇāsa-tīkā*.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 194: *Sagāthāvaggasamyut-tīkā*, 195: *Nidānavaggasamyut-tīkā*, 196: *Kandhavaggasamyut-tīkā*, 197: *Salāyatana-vaggasamyut-tīkā*, 198: *Mahāvaggasamyut-tīkā*; Spk-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I: *Sagāthavaggassa*

In the section on A (List 934b45) two different *tīkās* are listed: *tīgā aṅguttuiw krī* [mahā] (no. 75),<sup>28</sup> which is translated by G. H. Luce and Tin Htway: “Greater Aṅguttara subcommentary” and further identified as Sāratthamañjūsā, and *tīgā aṅguttuiw nay* [culla] (no. 76),<sup>29</sup> which is translated: “Lesser Aṅguttara subcommentary”.

The names of the two sets of *tīkās* are not mentioned in the inscription.

### 1.3. Gandhavaṁsa

Gandhavaṁsa (Gv), a much later work written by a Burmese *araññavāsin* Nandapaññā<sup>30</sup> probably in the 17th century,<sup>31</sup> lists both

---

*atthavaññanābhūtā Saṃyutta-tīkā*, II: *Nidāna-Khandha-Saṭṭayatana-Mahā-vaggānam* *atthavaññanābhūtā Saṃyutta-tīkā*. If the sequence of *vaggas* of Spk-pt given in the inscription was the same as in *Pit-sm* (1989) and in the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition the second entry should read *tīgā nidānavaggādi sañyut* and not *tīgā kandhavaggādi sañyut*. On variant recensions of Spk and Spk-pt which have a different order of the five *vaggas*, see Tseng, 2001, pp. xxvi–xxviii.

<sup>28</sup>The title written on the first folio of the MS of Mp-t held in the British Library (Or 2089) is very similar: *tīkā ekkapāt aṅgutra krī*. Cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 202–12: *Ekaṅguttara-tīkā-sac*, *Dukaṅguttara-tīkā-sac*, ... *Das-aṅguttara-tīkā-sac*, *Ekādasaṅguttara-tīkā-sac*; Mp-t B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I–III: *Sāratthamañjūsā nāma Aṅguttara-tīkā*. In Burmese *sac* means “new, revised”, *tīkā-sac* therefore means the “new *tīkā*”, i.e. Mp-t, *Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā*. In *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 202 it is also called *Mahātīkā*. All the Burmese words and sentences from *Pit-sm* (1989) which I quote here were translated into English by Elisabeth Lawrence, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 199: *Ekaṅguttara-tīkā-hon̄h*, 200: *Dukaṅguttara-tīkā-hon̄h*, 201: *Tikaṅguttara-tīkā-hon̄h*. *Hon̄h* in Burmese means “old, ancient”, *tīkā-hon̄h* therefore means the “old *tīkā*”, i.e. Mp-pt, *Catutthā Līnatthapakāśinī*.

<sup>30</sup>Gv 80,5–6: *iti pāmojjatthāyāraññavāsinā Nandapaññācariyena kato Cullagandhavaṁso*; Gv 79,26: *Haṃsāraṭṭhajāto Nandapañño ti visuto*. Haṃsāraṭṭha is the Pāli name for the kingdom of Pegu, the capital of which was Haṃsavatī. See *PLB*, p. 36.

<sup>31</sup>*PLB*, p. x. According to Oskar von Hinüber this is “a later systematic survey of unknown date” (*HPL*, p. 3). See also Winternitz, *HIL*, II, 176, n. 4; A.P.

*Līnatthapakāśinī* and Sāratthamañjūsā. The first one is mentioned as:

*Dīghanikāyāṭṭhakathādīnām catunnām aṭṭhakathānām Līnatthapakāśinī nāma tīkā*<sup>32</sup>

and was, according to Gv, written independently by Dhammapāl-ācariya.<sup>33</sup>

Sāratthamañjūsā is mentioned only as *Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya Sāratthamañjūsā nāma tīkā*,<sup>34</sup> a work written by Sāriputta.<sup>35</sup> Further on, this work of Sāriputta, which was written at the request of Parakkamabāhu, king of Laṅkā, is also referred to as *Aṅguttar'-aṭṭhakathāya navā tīkā gandho*.<sup>36</sup>

According to Gv, the *Līnatthapakāśinī* set consisted of the *tīkās* on all the four *nikāyas* and Sāratthamañjūsā was the name of the *tīkā* on A only. To distinguish it from the older *tīkā* on A (*Catutthā Līnatthapakāśinī*), Sāratthamañjūsā was also classified as a *navā tīkā*. This confirms the information given in the Pagan inscription where these two *tīkās* are mentioned as the “lesser” (*nay*) and the “greater” (*krī*) *tīkā*.<sup>37</sup> The other three *tīkās* of the Sāratthamañjūsā set (*Pathamā*, *Dutiyā*, and *Tatiyā Sāratthamañjūsā*) are — as in the Pagan inscription — not mentioned at all.

### 1.4. Sāsanavaṁsa

Sāsanavaṁsa (Sās), a work “written in Burma in 1861 by Paññā-

---

Buddhadatta, 1962, Vol. II, pp. 410–11; *PL*, pp. 180–81; Hazra, 1986, pp. 89–91.

<sup>32</sup>Gv 60,11–12.

<sup>33</sup>Gv 69,30–34: *Dīghanikāyāṭṭhakathādīnām catunnām aṭṭhakathānām tīkā-gandho ... attano matiyā Dhammapālācariyena katā*.

<sup>34</sup>Gv 61,32–33.

<sup>35</sup>Gv 61,30. Cf. H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 47, n. 154.

<sup>36</sup>Gv 71,10–14: *Sāratthadīpanī nāma ... Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya navā tīkā gandho ti ime cattāro gandhā Parakkamabāhūnāmena Laṅkādīpissarena raññā āyācitena Sāriputtācariyena katā*. Cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 202 where the later *tīkā* on Mp (Mp-t) is mentioned as “new greater *tīkā*” (*tīkā sac krī*).

<sup>37</sup>See notes 27–28 above.

sāmi, tutor of King Min-dōn who held the fifth council a few years later”,<sup>38</sup> does not give the names of the two sets of *tīkās* (Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā); it simply states that the Dīghanikāyātṭhakathāya *tīkā*, Majjhimanikāyātṭhakathāya *tīkā*, and Samyuttanikāyātṭhakathāya *tīkā* were written by Ācariya Dhammapāla Thera,<sup>39</sup> and the Aṅguttaranikāya-*tīkā* was written by Sāriputta Thera at the request of King Parakkamabāhu.<sup>40</sup>

The distinction between the two sets of *tīkās* mentioned in Saddhamma-s, and in the case of A also in the Pagan inscription and Gv, is not made in Sās. The two authors are nevertheless clearly stated, and this indicates that in the year 1861, when Sās was compiled, the only known set of *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* consisted of two kinds of *tīkās* — the older three on D, M, and S written by Dhammapāla, and the later one on A written by Sāriputta.

Sās also lists another much later *tīkā* on D called Sādhujanavilāsinī (Sv-nt)<sup>41</sup> written by the *saṅgharāja* Nāṇābhivamsa.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup>PL, pp. 181–82. King Min-dōn (1852–77), also called the “Convener of the Fifth Council”, held the council in Mandalay in 1868–71 (PLB, pp. 92–94). On Sās see also Buddhadatta, 1962, Vol. II, pp. 407–409; Lieberman, 1976, pp. 137–49; Hazra, 1986), pp. 91–94.

<sup>39</sup>Sās № 1961 31,10–12: Visuddhimaggassa mahātīkā, Dīghanikāyātṭhakathāya *tīkā*, Majjhimanikāyātṭhakathāya *tīkā*, Samyuttanikāyātṭhakathāya *tīkā sā ti imāyo ācariya-Dhammapālathero akāsi.*

<sup>40</sup>Sās № 1961 31,13–14: Sāratthadīpanī nāma *tīkam*, Aṅguttaranikāyātīkañ ca Parakkamabāhuraññā yācito Sāriputtathero akāsi.

<sup>41</sup>Sās № 1961 124,7–8: *saṅgharājā hutvā Sādhujanavilāsinīm nāma Dīghanikāyātīkam akāsi*. Cf. the title of Sv-nt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I-II: *Sīlakkhandhavagga-ātṭhakathāya atthavaṇṇanābhūtā Nāṇābhivamsa-dhammasenāpatināmena mahātherena katā Sādhuvilāsinī nāma Sīlakkhandhavagga-abhinavaṭīkā*.

<sup>42</sup>Nāṇābhivamsa, also mentioned as Nāṇābhisāsanadhajamahādhammarājaguruthera or Nāṇābhivamsadhammasenāpatimahādhammarājādhiraṇḍagurū (Sās № 1961 123,13–14, 25–26) was a *saṅgharāja* of Burma during the rule of King Bodōpayā (1782–1819) and also wrote, among several other works, Sādhu-(jana)-vilāsinī (Sv-nt) and Peṭakālamkāra, Netti-(navā)-mahātīkā (Nettmhī). See PLB, pp. 77–78; Buddhadatta, 1960, pp. 175–78; HPL, p. 176.

### 1.5. Sāsanavāmsadīpa

Sāsanavāmsadīpa (Sās-dīp) is a work “comparable” to Sās, but “devoted to the authors and books of Ceylon”.<sup>43</sup> It was completed in 1879 by ācariya Vimalasāra thera, published in 1880 in Colombo<sup>44</sup> and covers “the history of Buddhism in Ceylon down to the time of the introduction of the Burmese *upasampadā* in A.D. 1802”.<sup>45</sup> The information about the *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* in Sās-dīp is the same as in Sās. The names of the two sets of *tīkās* (Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā) given in Saddhamma-s and Gv are not mentioned at all. Only one set of *tīkās* is listed and it does not have any special name; the *tīkās* on D, M, and S are ascribed to Dhammapāla,<sup>46</sup> and a *tīkā* on A is ascribed to Sāriputta.<sup>47</sup>

Nāṇābhivamsa, who wrote Sādhujanavilāsinī, Sīlakkhandhavagga-abhinavaṭīkā (Sv-nt), is mentioned as the author of “several books

<sup>43</sup>PL, p. 182. Although most of the authors and books mentioned in Sās-dīp are from Ceylon, there are nevertheless also quite a few references to authors from India and Burma, e.g.: Aggavāmsa (v. 1238), Buddhappiya (v. 1239), Dāthānāga (v. 1241), Coliyācariya Sāriputtathera (v. 1244), Chappaṭa (v. 1247), Nāṇābhivamsa (v. 1215), etc. See also the Contents, *Vijānāpanam* and *Sūcīpattam* (pp. i–vii) in Sās-dīp; PLC, p. 311; Buddhadatta, 1962, Vol. II, pp. 409–10.

<sup>44</sup>The book has two title pages: the first one in Sinhala letters and the second in Roman letters. The Sinhala title page reads: *Sakyamunivasse 2423 [1879 CE], Sāsanavāmsadīpo, ācariya-Vimalasārattherapādena viracito, tassānumatiyā Balanāsara Virasihāmaccena c’ eva tadaññehi ca budhikehi Janehi Kolambatāñyasmīm Satthālokayantasālāyam muddāpito, Saugate samvacchare 2424 [1880 CE]*; the second title page reads: *The Sasanavansa dipo* or *The History of the Buddhist Church in Pali verse*, compiled from Buddhist Holy Scriptures, Commentaries, Histories, &c., &c. by Acariya Vimalasara Thera. A.B. 2423 (Colombo. Printed at the Satthaloka Press for Balatasara Virasinha Amacca and others, A.B. 2424.)

<sup>45</sup>PL, p. 182.

<sup>46</sup>Sās-dīp, vv. 1231–32: ... *tīkā Dīghāgamassa ca, Majjhimaṭṭhakathā-*tīkā* Samyuttaṭṭhakathāya ca, ... Dhammapālena dhīmatā racitā therapādena suttantanayadassinā.*

<sup>47</sup>Sās-dīp, vv. 1201–1203: *Aṅguttaranikāyātṭhakathā-*tīkā* ... therena Sāriputtena katā.*

beginning with Netti-ṭīkā”.<sup>48</sup>

#### 1.6. *Pitakat samuiñh*

*Pitakat samuiñh* “was composed in 1888 by Mañh-kriñ Mahā-siriyejasū, alias Úh Yam, Úh Yam, or Úh Ran, who had been the royal librarian of the last Burmese king”, and “represents an attempt to collect whatever information was available in Burma at that time on literary works in Pāli and Burmese and on their authors.”<sup>49</sup> *Pit-sm* (1989) is “the largest and the best work of its kind”; the author “lists 2047 titles, and he provides additional knowledge on most of the works listed.”<sup>50</sup>

*Pit-sm* (1989) lists the same ṭīkās on the four *nikāyas* as the Pagan inscription and Gv and, as already mentioned, the titles of the ṭīkās given in all three sources are very similar.<sup>51</sup> The names of the two sets, Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā, and the two authors, Dhammapāla and Sāriputta, are mentioned as in Gv. The reference numbers of all the ṭīkās on the four *nikāyas* listed in *Pit-sm* (1989)<sup>52</sup> are marked with asterisks, and according to this edition of *Pit-sm* that means the manuscripts of all these ṭīkās are held in the National Library, Rangoon.

The Līnatthapakāsinī-ṭīkās on D, M, and S, written by Dhammapāla, are listed as follows:

the Līnatthapakāsinī on D is listed under three entries: *Sut-*

<sup>48</sup> Sās-dīp, v. 1215: *Nāñābhivamsadhammādisenāpatiyatissaro, Nettīṭīkādayo neke gandhe viracayī sudhī.*

<sup>49</sup> Bechert 1979, p. xiii. The last Burmese king was Thibaw (1878–85), who was the successor of king Min-dōn (1852–77). See Bechert, 1966, Vol. II, pp. 6–7; also HPL, p. 3.

<sup>50</sup> Bechert 1979, p. xiii. In the edition of *Pit-sm* (1989) that I consulted, it is also mentioned that the reference numbers of the texts are marked with asterisks if manuscripts of them are held in the National Library (previously Bernard Free Library), Rangoon (*Pit-sm* (1989), p. 111, n. \*) — “so that the Pitakat samuiñh represents a rather complete catalogue of the Burmese National Library too” (Bechert 1979, p. xxxiv). Cf. also Thaw Kaung, 1998, pp. 403–14.

<sup>51</sup> See notes 24–28 above.

<sup>52</sup> *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 187–212.

*sīlakkhan-ṭīkā hoñh, Sut-mahāvā-ṭīkā and Sut-pātheyya-ṭīkā*,<sup>53</sup>

the Līnatthapakāsinī on M is also listed under three entries: *Mūlapaññāsa-ṭīkā, Majhimapaññāsa-ṭīkā and Uparipaññāsa-ṭīkā*,<sup>54</sup>

the Līnatthapakāsinī on S has five entries: *Sagāthavagga-samyut-ṭīkā, Nidānavagga-samyut-ṭīkā, Khandhavagga-samyut-ṭīkā, Salāyatanavagga-samyut-ṭīkā* and *Mahāvaggasamyut-ṭīkā*.<sup>55</sup>

*Pit-sm* (1989) lists two ṭīkās on A: a ṭīkā written by Dhammapāla and a ṭīkā written by Sāriputta. The first ṭīkā is listed as incomplete and has three entries: *Ekaṅguttara-ṭīkā-hoñh, Dukaṅguttara-ṭīkā-hoñh* and *Tikaṅguttara-ṭīkā-hoñh*. Although it is called the “old” (*hoñh*) ṭīkā the common name Līnatthapakāsinī is not mentioned at all.<sup>56</sup> According to *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 199, “the remaining eight manuscripts of the old ṭīkā, i.e. the ṭīkā on Catukaṅguttara, Pañcaṅguttara, ... Ekādasaṅguttara, cannot be found anywhere in Burma.”<sup>57</sup>

The second ṭīkā on A is mentioned as a “new, revised” ṭīkā (*sac*) and it has the following eleven entries:<sup>58</sup> *Ekaṅguttara-ṭīkā-sac, Duk'-aṅguttara-ṭīkā-sac, Tikaṅguttara-ṭīkā-sac, ... Dasāṅguttara-ṭīkā-sac, Ekādasaṅguttara-ṭīkā-sac*. The entry under *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 202 gives

<sup>53</sup> *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 187, 189–90. *Sīlakkhandhavagga-ṭīkā* is listed as the “old” (*hoñh*) ṭīkā, i.e. *Sv-pt, Pañhamā Līnatthapakāsinī*, to distinguish it not from *Sv-t, Pañhamā Sāratthamañjūsā*, but from *Sādhujanavilāsinī-ṭīkā* (*Sv-nt*) which is in *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 188 listed as the “new” (*sac*) ṭīkā.

<sup>54</sup> *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 191–93.

<sup>55</sup> *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 194–98.

<sup>56</sup> *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 199–201.

<sup>57</sup> Translated by Elisabeth Lawrence. *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 199 reads: *ekaṅguttara ṭīkā-hoñh — mhā | sī-huil-kvyāñh anurādha-mruñ anok badarati-ttha-kyonh-ne rhañ-dhammapāla-pru-saññ || thui-ṭīkā hoñh-kāñ ekaṅguttara | duk'-aṅguttara | tikaṅguttara 3-kyamh-sā aphvāñ ṭīkā-hoñh rhi-saññ || kyan-catukaṅguttara | pañcaṅguttara | chakkaṅguttara | sattaṅguttara | atth'-aṅguttara | navaṅguttara | dasaṅguttara | ekādasaṅguttara-tuin̄ aphvāñ ṭīkā-hoñh 8-coñ-kāñ ya-khu-mran-mā-tuin̄-nuin̄-nam̄-tvañ-ma-rhi-hu mhat-le ||* (word division as in *Pit-sm* (1989)).

<sup>58</sup> *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 202–12.

some additional information about this *tīkā*:

It was obtained by King Narapati of Pagan from Tamba[paññi]dīpa in Jambudīpa and was written during the reign of King Sirimahā-parakkamabāhu by a monk who was an expert in *dhamma* and had three names: Sāriputta, Sāratanuja, and Mahāsāmi. This new greater *tīkā* (*tīkā sac kri*) has eleven manuscripts/bundles, and it is called Sāratthamañjūsā and also Mahātīkā.<sup>59</sup>

Although *Pit-sm* (1989) gives essentially the same information about the *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* as the Pagan inscription and Gv, it is interesting to note that the old *tīkā* on A written by Dhammapāla is not mentioned as a part of the Līnatthapakāsinī set. *Pit-sm* (1989) also does not list any of the first three *tīkās* of the Sāratthamañjūsā set (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t).

### 1.7. Critical Pāli Dictionary

The last bibliographical source I would like to cite is *A Critical Pāli Dictionary (CPD)*, Epilegomena to Vol. I, pp. 40\*-41\*, which was published in 1948. Essentially it is very similar to the earliest bibliographical work, *Saddhamma-s*, because both sources mention two complete sets of *tīkās*, Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā. According to *CPD* the first set was written by Dhammapāla, and the second one by Sāriputta of Polonnaruva. The *tīkās* of the Līnatthapakāsinī set are also called *purāṇatīkās* (pt), while the *tīkās* of the Sāratthamañjūsā set are called just *tīkās* (t). Sādhujanavilāsinī, a later *tīkā* written by Nāṇābhivamsa, is called *navaṭīkā* (nt). For the first three *tīkās* of the older set (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt), for the fourth *tīkā* of the later set (Mp-t), and for the new *tīkā* on D (Sv-nt) some references are given to existing

<sup>59</sup>Translated by Elisabeth Lawrence. *Pit-sm* (1989) no. 202 reads: *ek'-anguttara-tīkā-sac mhā | jambūdip-kvyanh-tambadīpa-tuin̄h pugam praññ narapaticaññ-sū-mañh-nhañ-apruñ-sī-huñl-kvyanh-siri-mahāparakkama-bāhu-mañh lak-thak rhañ-sāriputtarā | rhañ-sāratanuja | rhañ-mahāsāmi-pāsāda 3-maññ raso mather-pru-saññ | thui-rhañ-sāriputtarā-kāḥ buddha-dāsa-mañh sāh-tō-taññh || anguttaranikāy 11-kyamh tīkā-sac-kriñ-kui-laññh sāratthamañjūsā-tīkā amaññ-mhaññ-saññ | mahātīkā-laññh-khō-saññ ||* (word division as in *Pit-sm* (1989)).

published editions or manuscripts.<sup>60</sup> For the first three *tīkās* of the later set (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t)<sup>61</sup> no manuscripts or editions are mentioned, and the fourth *tīkā* of the older set (Mp-pt) is referred to *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 199–201.<sup>62</sup> This indicates that although in *CPD* both sets of *tīkās* are listed, only four *tīkās* were actually available to the editor of *CPD*: the first three of the Līnatthapakāsinī set and the fourth of the Sāratthamañjūsā set.

The above discussion of the bibliographical references can be presented as shown in Table 1 overleaf:

<sup>60</sup>The following sources are given: for Sv-pt, B<sup>e</sup> 1924 I–III (2.1,11); for Ps-pt and Spk-pt, the transcripts (1934) from Burmese manuscripts of the National Library (former Bernard Free Library), Rangoon (2.2,11; 2.3,11; cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 191–98); for Mp-t, B<sup>e</sup> 1910 I–II (2.4,12); for Sv-nt, B<sup>e</sup> 1913–23 I–II (2.1,13). *CPD*, Vol. III, p. iv, mentions also Sv-t as “*Silakkandhavaggatīkā* by Dhammapāla, B<sup>e</sup>, Vol. I–II, (*Buddhasāsanasaññi*), Rangoon, 1961”, which is a mistake; this could be either Sv-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I by Dhammapāla, or Sv-nt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I–II by Nāṇābhivamsa. Other editions and manuscripts of these *tīkās* will be discussed below.

<sup>61</sup>*CPD*, nos. 2.1,12; 2.2,12; 2.3,12. The manuscripts of these *tīkās* listed in *LPP* will be discussed below.

<sup>62</sup>*CPD*, no. 2.4,11.

Table I: The *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* in bibliographical works

Source	D/Sv	M/Ps	S/Spk	A/Mp	Authorship
1.1. Sad-s <sup>63</sup> (14th cent.)	pt* <sup>64</sup> t*	pt* t*	pt* t*	pt* t*	porānas theras
1.2. Pagan (1442)	(p)t	(p)t	(p)t	pt	—
1.3. Gv (17th cent.)	pt*	pt*	pt*	pt* (n)t*	Dhammapāla Sāriputta
1.4. Sās (1861)	(p)t	(p)t	(p)t	—	Dhammapāla
	(n)t	—	—	t	Sāriputta Ñāṇābhivamṣa
1.5. Sās-dīp (1880)	(p)t	(p)t	(p)t	—	Dhammapāla
	(n)t	—	—	t	Sāriputta Ñāṇābhivamṣa
1.6. Piṭ-sm (1888) (1989)	(p)t* —	(p)t* —	(p)t* —	pt t*	Dhammapāla Sāriputta Ñāṇābhivamṣa
1.7. CPD (1948)	pt* t* nt	pt* t* —	pt* t* —	pt* t* —	Dhammapāla Sāriputta Ñāṇābhivamṣa

2. Manuscripts and editions of the *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas*

The bibliographical sources in Table I can be divided into three groups: works which mention only one set of *nikāya-tīkās* (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t, see 1.4, 1.5), works which list an additional *Ānguttara-tīkā* (i.e. Mp-pt, see 1.2, 1.3, 1.6), and works which list two complete sets of *nikāya-tīkās* (the old set, Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt, and the later set, Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t, see 1.1, 1.7). Here I would like to discuss manuscripts and printed editions of the *nikāya-tīkās* belonging to both sets.

<sup>63</sup>Sad-s = Saddhamma-s.

<sup>64</sup>The *tīkās* listed as Līnatthapakāsinī (pt) or Sāratthamañjūsā (t) are marked with \*.

2.1. One set of *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas*

Sās and Sās-dīp mention only one set of *tīkās*,<sup>65</sup> consisting of the three “older” *tīkās* (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt) ascribed to Dhammapāla and the fourth “later” *tīkā* (Mp-t) ascribed to Sāriputta. There is no distinction between Līnatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā; all are just called *tīkās*. Besides the Chatthasaṅgāyana editions<sup>66</sup> there exist several other editions<sup>67</sup> and manuscripts of these *tīkās*.<sup>68</sup> Because these are the only

<sup>65</sup>Sv-nt, compiled by Ñāṇābhivamṣa, will not be discussed from here onwards because it is a much later work. There exists a Chatthasaṅgāyana ed.: Sv-nt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I-II; CPD, Epilegomena to Vol. I, p. 40\*, mentions also Sv-nt B<sup>e</sup> 1913–23 I-II (2.1,13). The Chatthasaṅgāyana edition of this *tīkā* is available also on CS CD-ROM.

<sup>66</sup>Sv-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I-III; Ps-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I-III; Spk-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I-II; Mp-t B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I-III. The Chatthasaṅgāyana editions of these *tīkās* were reprinted by the Vipassana Research Institute, Igatpuri, India (Sv-pt N<sup>e</sup> 1993 I-III; Ps-pt N<sup>e</sup> 1995 I-IV; Spk-pt N<sup>e</sup> 1994 I-III; Mp-t N<sup>e</sup> 1996 I-III), and are available also on CS CD-ROM.

<sup>67</sup>Sv-pt: E<sup>e</sup> 1970 I-III, ed. by Lily de Silva; B<sup>e</sup> 1904–1906 I-III, ed. by U Hpye; B<sup>e</sup> 1912 I-III, ed. by Hsaya Tin of Nanmadaw; B<sup>e</sup> 1915 I-III, ed. by Hsaya Kyi, Kyaw, Thein, and Hba Kyaw (all the Burmese editions are called Līnatthappakāsanā; see Raper and O’Keefe, 1983, p. 34); B<sup>e</sup> 1924 I-III (see Warder, 1980, p. 529); C<sup>e</sup> 1967, ed. by H. Kalyāṇasiri and H. Kalyāṇadhamma, Somavati Ḫēvāvitāraṇa Tīkāghanthamālā (Colombo: Anula Press).

Ps-pt (Bangchang, 1981), p. xi, mentions a very old Burmese edition published in 1853.

Spk-pt: Besides the Chatthasaṅgāyana edition (Spk-pt B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I-II = N<sup>e</sup> 1994 I-III) I am not aware of any other edition of Spk-pt.

Mp-t: E<sup>e</sup> I (1996), II (1998), III (1999); PTS edition by P. Pecenko, Vols. I-III contain *Eka-* and *Dukanipāta-tīkā*; B<sup>e</sup> 1910 I-II (see CPD, Epilegomena to Vol. I, p. 41\*); C<sup>e</sup> 1907 (see de Silva, 1910–12, p. 150); C<sup>e</sup> 1930 (see EncBuddh, Vol. I, fasc. 4, p. 629, s.v. *Ānguttara-navaṭīkā*). Mp-t C<sup>e</sup> 1907 and 1930 contain only *Ekanipāta-tīkā*. For a detailed description of C<sup>e</sup> 1907, B<sup>e</sup> 1910, and C<sup>e</sup> 1930, see Pecenko, Introduction in Mp-t E<sup>e</sup> (1996) I, pp. xxxvii–xlii.

<sup>68</sup>MSS of Sv-pt are listed in: Lily de Silva, General Introduction in Sv-pt E<sup>e</sup>, pp. xi–xii (7 C MSS; these MSS are listed in LPP); LPP I 39 (16 C MSS); Fausböll, 1890–96, p. 28 (1 B MS); H. Braun et al., 1985, pp. 126–28 (1 B MS); Rhys Davids, 1882, p. 52 (1 C MS); Piṭ-sm (1989) nos. 187, 189–90 (1

ones printed these *tīkās* are often considered to be the only existing *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas*.<sup>69</sup>

## 2.2. Two Aṅguttara-tīkās

In the Pagan inscription, Gv, and *Pit-sm* (1989), an additional *tīkā* — not mentioned in Sās and Sās-dīp — is added: the old *tīkā* on A (Mp-pt), called Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī.

According to one of the latest editions of *Pit-sm* (1989) (nos. 199–201) an incomplete manuscript of Mp-pt (containing the old *tīkā* on the first three *nipātas*) is now held in the National Library, Rangoon.<sup>70</sup>

During my stay in Burma in December 1999, I visited the National Library, Rangoon, and the Universities Central Library, Rangoon University Campus. In both libraries I searched for manuscripts of Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇatīkā, Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī (Mp-pt). In the

---

B MS).

MSS of Ps-pt are listed in: Bangchang, 1981, p. xi (1 K MS, 4 C MSS; these 4 C MSS are listed in *LPP*); *LPP*, vol. 1, p. 71 (8 C MSS), vol. 2, p. 53 (6 C MSS); Rhys Davids, 1882, p. 51 (1 C MS); Fausböll, 1890–96, pp. 28–29 (1 B MS); Rhys Davids, 1883, p. 147 (1 B MS); *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 191–93 (1 B MS).

MSS of Spk-pt are listed in: *LPP*, vol. 1, p. 93 (1 B, 11 C MSS), vol. 2, p. 71 (7 C MSS); Silva, 1938, Vol. I, pp. 36–37 (1 C MS); *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 194–98 (1 B MS).

MSS of Mp-t are listed in: *LPP*, Vol I, p. 2 (5 C MSS); Vol. II, p. 1 (7 C MSS); Vol. III, p. 164 (1 B MS from British Museum, Or 2089); de Silva, 1938, Vol. I, p. 37 (1 C MS); *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 202–12 (1 B MS); Fragile Palm Leaves project, Thailand (4 B MSS; MS ID Nos. 906, 949, 983, 1645); National Library, Rangoon (3 B MSS; Acc. Nos. 800, 1846, 1937); Universities Central Library, University of Rangoon (2 B MSS; Acc. Nos. 7691, 9816/10095).

This list is, of course, not exhaustive; it is possible that more manuscripts of the above mentioned *tīkās* can be found in Burma and perhaps also in Thailand.

<sup>69</sup>See for example *HPL*, pp. 167, 173.

<sup>70</sup>In May 1999, I met U Thaw Kaung, retired Chief Librarian of Universities Central Library, Rangoon, who confirmed that this manuscript could be held in the National Library, Rangoon. See also 1.6 and n. 50 above.

National Library, which was in the process of moving into a new building, I was not able to find any manuscript of Mp-pt, but in the Universities Central Library I found, with the generous help of U Thaw Kaung, a manuscript (Acc. No. 10095) which contained both Aṅguttara-tīkās, Mp-pt and Mp-t, in one bundle. For a detailed description of this manuscript of Mp-pt — the only one known to me — see Part II, 1 below.

## 2.3. Two complete sets of *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas*

Saddhamma-s and CPD mention two complete sets, Līnatthapakāsinī (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt) and Sāratthamañjūsā (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t). Here, three later *tīkās* are added: a *tīkā* on D (Sv-t) called Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsā, a *tīkā* on M (Ps-t) called Dutiyā Sāratthamañjūsā and a *tīkā* on S (Spk-t) called Tatiyā Sāratthamañjūsā.

I am not aware of any printed edition of these three later *tīkās* (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t); it is also interesting to note that they are not mentioned in the Burmese bibliographical works discussed above. Somadasa's catalogue *Lankāvē puskoļa pot nāmāvaliya* (*LPP*), on the other hand, lists quite a few manuscripts of Sv-t, Ps-t and Spk-t.<sup>71</sup> Since the catalogue also clearly distinguishes the *purāṇatīkās* (Līnatthapakāsinī) from the later *tīkās* (*navatīkā*, *dutiyatīkā*) called Sāratthamañjūsā, it seems that Somadasa as well as the temple librarians who gave him information about the manuscripts held in their temples was clearly aware of the difference between these two sets of *tīkās*. In *LPP* the manuscripts of Sv-t, Ps-t and Spk-t are listed as follows:

Sv-t: six manuscripts s.v. *Dīghanikāya-dutiyatīkā*, *Paṭhama-Sāratthamañjūsā*:<sup>72</sup>

1 C MS in Tapodhanārāma Purāṇa Mahāvihāraya, Kāṭapalagoda,

<sup>71</sup>See *LPP*, Vol. I, pp. 39, 71, 93. In 1995 I sent several letters to the temples in Sri Lanka listed in *LPP* and enquired about the *tīkās* held in their libraries, but I received no reply.

<sup>72</sup>*LPP*, Vol. 1, p. 39 (cf. below this entry s.v. *Dīghanikāyapaṭhama-(purāṇa)-tīkā*, *Paṭhama-Līnatthappakāsinī*, *Līnatthapakāsanā*, *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* where 16 MSS of Sv-pt are listed).

Karandeṇiya, Vatugedara, Ambalamgoḍa (temple no. 348);  
 1 C MS in Śailabimbārāmaya, Dodandūva (temple no. 365);  
 1 C MS in Sundarārāma Mahāvihāraya (Dhammadānanda Pustakālaya), Ambalamgoḍa (temple no. 371);  
 1 C MS in Gaṅgārāma Mahāvihāraya, Padavtoṭa, Māhālla, Gälla (temple no. 381);  
 1 C MS in Subhadrārāma Vihāraya, Murutamurē, Hakmana (temple no. 487);  
 1 C MS in Kasāgal Rajamahāvihāraya, Udayāla, Hakuruvela (temple no. 717).  
 Ps-ṭ: eight manuscripts s.v. *Majjhimanikāya-navaṭīkā*, *Dutiya-Sāratthamañjūsā*:<sup>73</sup>  
 1 C MS in Tapassarārāmaya, Moraṭumulla, Moraṭuva (temple no. 64);<sup>74</sup>  
 1 C MS in Saddharmākara Pirivena, Pinvatta, Pānaduraya (temple no. 153);  
 1 B MS<sup>75</sup> in Vanavāsa Rajamahāvihāraya (Paṇḍitaratna Pirivena), Yātrāmulla, Bentara, Bentoṭa (temple no. 326);  
 1 C MS in Tapodhanārāma Purāṇa Mahāvihāraya, Kāṭapālagoda, Karandeṇiya, Vatugedara, Ambalamgoḍa (temple no. 348);

<sup>73</sup>LPP, Vol. I, p. 71 (cf. below this entry s.v. *Majjhimanikāya-purāṇaṭīkā*, *Dutiya-Līnattha-ppakāsinī*, *Līnatthappakāsinī*, *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* where 7 MSS of Ps-ṭ are listed). W.A. de Silva mentions also a manuscript of *Majjhimanikāya-ṭīkā*, *Papañcasūdanī-ṭīkā*, *Dutiya-Sāratthamañjūsā* (i.e. Ps-ṭ) held in the Library of the Colombo Museum; see de Silva, 1938, Vol. I, p. 36, MSS 108–109. However, the introductory passage quoted in the catalogue is identical with Ps-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I 1,5–12 which indicates that the manuscript is most probably Ps-ṭ and not Ps-ṭ. See also Bangchang, 1981, p. xii.

<sup>74</sup>There is also a MS of Ps-ṭ held in the same temple; see LPP, Vol. I, p. 71, s.v. *Majjhimanikāya-purāṇaṭīkā*, *Dutiya-Līnatthappakāsinī*, *Līnatthappakāsinī*, *Līnatthavaṇṇanā*.

<sup>75</sup>The Burmese manuscript listed here could indicate that in addition to Mp-ṭ, the other three later ṭīkās (*Sāratthamañjūsā* I–III) were also known in Burma. Cf. the discussion on the Pagan inscription, Gv, Sās and Piṭ-sm (1989) in 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6 above. Here further research about *nikāya-ṭīkās* in Burma is needed.

1 C MS in Śailabimbārāmaya, Dodandūva (temple no. 365);  
 1 C MS in Sirivadḍhanārāmaya, Dēvagoda, Mādampē, Ambalamgoḍa (temple no. 367);  
 1 C MS in Jinajōtikārāmaya, Mūdavela, Udukinda, Fort Mekdonald (temple no. 807);  
 1 C MS in Sunandārāmaya (Sunandodaya Pirivena), Mādampē, Aṭakaṭanpanna (temple no. 860).

Spk-ṭ: two manuscripts:

1 C Ms held in Yaṭagala Rajamahāvihāraya (Hettīhāvala Pirivena), Unavaṭuna (temple no. 435) is listed s.v. *Samyuttanikāya-navaṭīkā*, *Tatiya-Sāratthamañjūsā*;<sup>76</sup>  
 1 C MS in the same bundle with Spk-ṭ is mentioned s.v. *Samyuttanikāya-ṭīkā*<sup>77</sup> and is held in Jinajōtikārāmaya, Mūdavela, Udukinda, Fort Mekdonald (temple no. 807).

The above list of the manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ and Spk-ṭ held in the temple libraries in Sri Lanka indicates that the information given in Saddhamma-s could be correct.

The editions and manuscripts of the two sets of ṭīkās discussed above can be presented as follows:

<sup>76</sup>LPP, Vol. I, p. 93.

<sup>77</sup>LPP, ibid. Under the temple entry no. 807, the following note is added: *mehi naṭīkā, purāṇaṭīkā dekama miśravī āta*. This manuscript has also — as the Burmese MS of Mp-ṭ / Mp-ṭ discussed in Part I, 2.2, and Part II — both ṭīkās (Spk-ṭ and Spk-ṭ) in one bundle.

In an email dated 23 May 2001, L.S. Cousins also informs me that Sister H. Vinita Tseng “on her visit to Taiwan last month ... obtained copies of some manuscripts (mostly Burmese) in a collection there. One was a ṭīkā labelled *Sāratthamañjūsā*, apparently to Spk [that is, Spk-ṭ].” This is a further indication that, as stated in n. 75 above, in addition to Mp-ṭ, the other three later ṭīkās (*Sāratthamañjūsā* I–III: Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ) were probably also known in Burma.

Table II : Manuscripts and printed editions of the *ṭīkās* on the four *nikāyas*

Līnatthapakāsinī		Sāratthamañjūsā	
D/Sv	Sv-pt Eds.: Be 1904–1906, 1912, 1915, 1924, 1961; Ce 1967; Ee 1970; Ne 1993 MSS: 3 B, 17 C	Sv-ṭ Ed. ——	
M/Ps	Ps-pt Eds.: Be 1853, 1961; Ne 1995 MSS: 3 B, 15 C, 1 K	Ps-ṭ Ed. ——	MSS: 1 B, 7 C
S/Spk	Spk-pt Ed.: Be 1961, Ne 1994 MSS: 2 B, 19 C	Spk-ṭ Ed. ——	MSS: 1 B (?), n. 79), 2 C
A/Mp	Mp-pt Ed. ——  MSS: 1 B (see Part I, 2.2 above) 1 B (see n. 56 above)	Mp-ṭ Eds.: Be 1910, 1961; Ce 1907, 1930; Ee 1996; Ne 1996  MSS: 11 B, 13 C	

## Part II: Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī and Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā

## I. Description of the Burmese manuscript of Mp-pt from Universities Central Library, Rangoon (Acc. No. 10095)

The titles on the cover of this manuscript read *Āṅguttuir-ṭīkā-sac* / [*Āṅguttuir-ṭīkā*]-*hoṇh*, the same titles as used in *Pit-sm* (1989) (nos. 199–201, 202–12) for describing the “old” (*hoṇh*) and the “new” (*sac*) *Āṅguttaraṭīkā*. The manuscript has regular Burmese foliation on the right margin verso of each folio; each folio has eleven lines written in small round Burmese letters, and there are very few of the orthographic errors which are common in Burmese manuscripts. The manuscript has two parts:

(1) Folios *ka-ṭhai* (140 fol.) contain seven *nipāta-ṭīkās* of Mp-ṭ; it begins with *Pañcakanipāta-ṭīkā* and ends with *Ekādasanipātaṭīkā*.<sup>78</sup> On the left margin verso of each folio is written *Āṅguttuir-ṭīkā-sac pāṭh* (*du[tiya]*) and the last folio of this section (*ṭhai*) has the title: *Āṅguttara-mahāṭīkā*, that is, Mp-ṭ. According to the colophon the manuscript was edited by Paññājotābhidhaja<sup>79</sup> in 1219 BE (1857 CE) in Bākarā monastery in Mandalay and copied by an unknown scribe in 1254 BE (1892 CE).

(2) Folios *tho-po* (108 fol.) contain the “old” *Āṅguttara-ṭīkā* (*Āṅguttuirṭīkā-hoṇh*), that is, *Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇaṭīkā*, *Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī* (Mp-pt). On the left margin verso of each folio is written *Āṅguttuir-ṭīkā-hoṇh pāṭh*. This is the first manuscript of Mp-pt that is known to me;<sup>80</sup> I am also not aware of any printed edition of the

<sup>78</sup>The first four *nipāta-ṭīkās* of Mp-ṭ, *Ekanipāta-ṭīkā-Catukkanipāta-ṭīkā*, are in another manuscript held in the same library (Acc. No. 9816).

<sup>79</sup>On Paññājotābhidhaja, see Primož Pecenko, “Introduction” in Mp-pt I, pp. xxxix–xl.

<sup>80</sup>According to U Nyunt Maung, Manuscript Consultant, Universities Historical Research Centre, Rangoon, it is possible that more MSS of Mp-pt are held in the temple libraries in Burma. But because of the extensive use of the later *ṭīkā* (Mp-ṭ), which replaced the older one, these manuscripts were probably not used much. In a letter dated 10 October 1995, Prof. U Ko Lay informs me that “the *bhikkhu* teachers of advanced *Pitakas* at the [Buddhist] University are not sure whether the old *ṭīkās* of Āṅguttara [Mp-pt] are still extant at all.... [T]eachers in various monasteries have ... always used the new *ṭīkā*, the Sāratthamañjūsā of Sāriputta [Mp-ṭ], also called Mahāṭīkā, because ... the expositions therein are, according to them, much better and preferable. The old Āṅguttara-ṭīkās appear to be out of use in Myanma monasteries for a long time ... for two reasons: only three *ṭīkās* have been listed in their libraries [cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) 199–201]; the remaining eight were never existent in Myanma and ... [even] the first three are not too well known amongst present day *bhikkhu* scholars. For the same reasons, the Sixth Council completely ignored the old Āṅguttara-ṭīkās and recited only the new *ṭīkās* [cf. *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 202–12], the complete set of which was also published [i.e. Mp-ṭ Be 1961].”

The situation in Sri Lanka and Thailand seems to be quite different. In an email dated 22 November 1999, L.S. Cousins writes, “I am not at all clear as to the Āṅguttara-ṭīkā ascribed to Dhammapāla (Mp-pt). I could not find any

“old” Aṅguttara-ṭīkā.

The manuscript contains the *ṭīkā* on the first three *nipātas* only:<sup>81</sup> it contains most of the *Ekanipāta-ṭīkā* (folios tho<sup>v,1</sup>–dho<sup>r,10</sup>)<sup>82</sup> and longer passages from *Dukanipātaṭīkā* (folios dho<sup>v,10</sup>–na<sup>v,8</sup>)<sup>83</sup> and *Tikanipāta-ṭīkā* (folios na<sup>v,8</sup>–po<sup>v,4</sup>).<sup>84</sup>

The text on the first few folios of the newly discovered manuscript of Mp-ṭī is exactly the same (with minor orthographic differences) as in the other three “old” *ṭīkās*<sup>85</sup> and in this respect differs considerably from Mp-ṭ.<sup>86</sup> This is a very strong indication that the manuscript discussed here really belongs to the old Līnatthappakāśinī set.

The text on the last folio (po) ends abruptly in the middle of *Tikanipāta-ṭīkā*<sup>87</sup> and a colophon follows. The title given in the colophon is *Aṅguttuir-ṭīkā-hoñh-pāṭh*, the editor (*visodhaka*) who “collated” the text from “different readings” (*samsandiy’ aññapāṭhehi*) is Jotābhīnāmathera, who lived in Maṇipupphara monastery. The date of editing is

---

copy in Ceylon or Thailand in the 1970s. In fact, I am reasonably sure that there is no copy in Ceylon. Some are listed in various sources, but I believe that all have turned out to be mistakes, when checked.”

<sup>81</sup>Cf. *Pit-sm* (1989), no. 199; and Part I, 1.6, above.

<sup>82</sup>The text of *Ekanipāta-ṭīkā* corresponds approximately to Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> I 1,1–III 163,8. There are considerable differences between Mp-ṭī and Mp-ṭ: most of the chapters of the *Ekanipāta-ṭīkā* of Mp-ṭī are, compared with the same chapters in Mp-ṭ, much shorter; e.g. *Nettinayavāṇṇanā* on *Rūpādivagga* is much longer in Mp-ṭ (cf. Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> I 76,1–97,7) than in the MS of Mp-ṭī where it is given on three folios only (dhū<sup>r,9</sup>–dho<sup>v,8</sup>).

<sup>83</sup>This corresponds approximately to Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> III 195,5–253,7 (folios dho<sup>r,10</sup>–na<sup>r,8</sup> actually contain much less text, since on the folio dham<sup>r,6</sup> is a lacuna corresponding to Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> III 204,3–241,12).

<sup>84</sup>This corresponds approximately to Mp-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1961 II 83,16–148,2. This is at present the only known and available manuscript of Mp-ṭī; for a textual comparison of three selected parallel chapters from Mp-ṭī and Mp-ṭ see Part II, 2 below.

<sup>85</sup>Cf. Sv-ṭī E<sup>e</sup> I 1,1 foll.; Ps-ṭī B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I 1,1 foll.; Spk-ṭī B<sup>e</sup> 1961 I 1,1 foll.

<sup>86</sup>Cf. Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> I 1,1 foll.

<sup>87</sup>Cf. Mp-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1961 II 148,2.

not given and the date of copying is 1254 BE (1892 CE).<sup>88</sup>

Although according to Saddhamma-s the “old” *ṭīkā* (Mp-ṭī) was a basis for the later one (Mp-ṭ), many passages in this manuscript of Mp-ṭī are nevertheless essentially different from the parallel passages in Mp-ṭ. The differences and similarities of some of these passages will be to some extent discussed in Part II, 2–3 below.

It is also interesting to note that in this manuscript both *ṭīkās*, Mp-ṭī and Mp-ṭ, are in the same bundle, which could indicate that these two *ṭīkās* were, probably at least during a certain period, consulted together, complementing each other.

## 2. Three chapters from Aṅguttaranikāya-purāṇatīkā, *Catutthā Līnatthappakāśinī* (Mp-ṭī)

This section contains the following three chapters from the manuscript of Aṅguttaranikāya-purāṇatīkā, *Catutthā Līnatthappakāśinī* (Mp-ṭī, see Part II, 1) and the differences from the parallel chapters in Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> 1998 II:

Mp-ṭī, *Ekanipāta-ṭīkā* III: *Akammaniyavaggo tatiyo* (folio ṇu<sup>r,5</sup>–  
ṇu<sup>v,5</sup>); cf. *Akammaniyavaggavāṇṇanā*, a parallel chapter in Mp-ṭ  
II 36,1–38,12;

Mp-ṭī, *Ekanipāta-ṭīkā* IV: *Adantavaggo catuttho* (folio ṇu<sup>v,5</sup>–8); cf.  
*Adantavaggavāṇṇanā*, a parallel chapter in Mp-ṭ II 39,1–14;

Mp-ṭī, *Ekanipāta-ṭīkā* V: *Anatthavaggo pañcamo* (folios ṇu<sup>v,8</sup>–  
ṇe<sup>r,11</sup>); cf. *Panihita-acchavaggavāṇṇanā*, a parallel chapter in  
Mp-ṭ II, 40,1–60,17.

<sup>88</sup>Folio po<sup>r,9–11</sup> reads: *Jotābhīnāmathera* || *Maṇipuppharavāśinā* || *samsandiy’ añña-pāṭhehi* || *sādhukāyam ‘bhisañkhatā* || *Sakkarāja* 1254 ||. Jotābhīnāmathera is [Paññā]jotābhi-[dhaja]nāmathera who also edited the portion of Mp-ṭ in the same bundle (see (1) above) and the editing probably took place approximately at the same time, i.e. around 1219 BE (1857 CE). According to U Nyunt Maung, Maṇipupphara was a name of a temple belonging to a larger monastic complex in Mandalay called Bākarā.

These three chapters were chosen because they clearly demonstrate the differences between the two *tīkās* (Mp-pṭ and Mp-t) as described in Saddhamma-s. This is a short preliminary comparison of the two *tīkās* and final conclusions will be drawn only when a critical edition of the entire manuscript of Mp-pṭ is completed and compared with Mp-t.

Here the main text is Mp-pṭ and the differences in Mp-t are given in the footnotes. In two cases, where the additions in Mp-t are very long (see Part II, 2, n. 140 and n. 217 below), the entire text from Mp-t is given in the endnotes (see Part II, 2, endnotes (1) and (2) below). Since the text in the manuscript of Mp-pṭ has only a few orthographic errors, the above three chapters will be reproduced here in Roman transliteration without any changes. Mp-t stands here for Mp-t E<sup>e</sup> 1998 II and Mp-pṭ stands for the manuscript of Aṅguttaranikāya-purāṇatīkā, Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī (Mp-pṭ), described in Part II, 1, above.

[Akammaniyavaggo tatiyo]<sup>89</sup>

(1) <sup>90</sup>**abhbāvitān** [52,1]<sup>91</sup> ti samathavipassanābhāvanāvasena na bhāvitam tathā abhbāvitattā. tam hi *avaḍḍhitān* [52,1] ti vuccati paṭipakkhābhībhavena paribrūhanābhāvato. ten' āha bhagavā **akamma-niyam hotī** [52,3] ti.

(2) *dutiye vuttapariyāyena*<sup>92</sup> attho *veditabbo* [52,5]. *paṭhame* [52,6] ti tatiyavaggassa paṭhamasutte. *vattavasenā* [52,6] ti *vipākavaṭṭavasena*. *tebhūmakavaṭṭan* [52,8–9] ti tebhūmakavipākavaṭṭam.<sup>93</sup> *vattapaṭilābhāya kamman* [52,9] ti *vipākavaṭṭassa paṭilābhāya upanissayabhūtam kammam*, tassa sahāyabhūtam \**kilesavaṭṭan* ti vadanti. tathā hi tam *vattapaṭilābhāya kamman* [52,9] ti vuttam.\*<sup>94</sup> *vivattapaṭilābhāya kamman* [52,10–11] ti *vivattādhibigamassa upanissayabhūtam kammam*. *yam pana carabhavanibbattakakammam*,<sup>95</sup> tam *vivattappaṭilābhāya kammam hoti*, na hoti ti. na hoti *vattapādakabhāvato*. *carimabhava-paṭisandhi* viya pana *vivattūpanissayo* ti sakkā viññātum. na hi kadā ci *tihetukapaṭisandhiyā* vinā visesādhibigamo sambhavati. *imesu suttesū* [52,11] ti *imesu*<sup>96</sup> *paṭhamadutiyesu suttesu*<sup>97</sup> *yathākkamaṇ vattavattam* eva kathitam.

(3) <sup>98</sup>**abhbāvitān** ti ettha bhāvanā nāma samādhībhāvanā. sā yattha āsamkitabbā, tam kāmāvacarapāṭhamamahākusalačittādi-abhbāvitān ti adhippetan ti āha *devamanussasampattiyo* [52,15] ti ādi.

(4) catutthe yasmā *cittan* [52,22] ti *vivattavasena*<sup>99</sup> uppannaṁ cittam<sup>100</sup> adhippetam, tasmā jātijarābyādhimaraṇasokādiddukkhassa anibbattanato mahato atthāya samvattatī ti yojanā veditabbā.

<sup>89</sup>This title is given in Mp-pṭ at the end of this chapter; Mp-t III. Akammaniyavaggavaṇṇanā <sup>90</sup>Mp-t adds: tatiyassa paṭhame <sup>91</sup>These numbers refer to page and line in Mp E<sup>e</sup> 1973 I. <sup>92</sup>= Mp-t v.l.; Mp-t : vuttapariyāyena <sup>93</sup>Mp-t: -bhūmaka- <sup>94</sup>Mp-t reads: *kilesavaṭṭam pi kammaggahaṇen'* eva saṅgahitan ti daṭṭhabbam for \**kilesavaṭṭan* ti ... *vattapaṭilābhāya kamman* ti vuttam\* <sup>95</sup>Mp-t: *carimabhavanibbattakam kammam* <sup>96</sup>Mp-t adds: pana <sup>97</sup>Mp-t: *paṭhamadutiyasuttesu* (for: *paṭhamadutiyesu suttesu*) <sup>98</sup>Mp-t adds: tatiye <sup>99</sup>Mp-t: -vasen' eva <sup>100</sup>Mp-t: uppannacittam (for: uppannaṁ cittam)

(5–6) <sup>101</sup>*uppannan* [52,26] ti ekuppādādikhaṇṭattayam<sup>102</sup> pi  
*abhavitam*<sup>103</sup> [52,26] bhāvanārahitaṁ apātubhūtam [52,26] eva  
 pañditassa sammatassa<sup>104</sup> uppannakiccassa asādhāraṇato<sup>105</sup> yathā:

aputto ti. [cf. Mogg III 17]

yo<sup>106</sup> hi samattho hutvā pitu puttakiccaṁ asādheti so<sup>107</sup> aputto ti loke  
 vuccati, evam sampadam idam pi.<sup>108</sup> ten’ āha *kasmā* [53,1] ti ādi.  
*etesu*<sup>109</sup> *dhammesū* [53,4] ti lokuttarapādakajhānādisu.<sup>110</sup> therō pana  
 matthakapattam<sup>111</sup> eva bhāvitam<sup>112</sup> dassento *maggacittam evā* [53,6] ti  
 āha.

(7–8) <sup>113</sup>*punappunaṁ akan*<sup>114</sup> [53,8] ti bhāvanābahulikārādivasena<sup>115</sup>  
 punappunaṁ na kataṁ. *imāni pi dve* [53,9] ti imesu dvisu<sup>116</sup> suttesu  
 āgatāni imāni pi dve cittāni.

(9) <sup>117</sup>*dukkham adhivahati*<sup>118</sup> [53,12–13] ti \*tam adhibhavantum  
 katvā vahati. adhivāsenā gahitabbam katvā vahati. āharatī [53,13] ti\*<sup>119</sup>  
 āneti. *dukkhenā* [53,15] ti kicchena. *duppesanato* [53,20] ti dukkhena  
 pesetabbato.

(10) matthakapattam vipassanāsukham pākatikajhānasukhato<sup>120</sup>  
 santatarapaṇitaram<sup>121</sup> evā ti āha *jhānasukhato* *vipassanāsukhan* [53,24]  
 ti. ten’ āha bhagavā:

suññāgāram paviṭṭhassa santacittassa bhikkhuno  
 amānuśī ratī<sup>122</sup> hoti sammā dhammaṁ vipassato  
 yato yato sammasati khandhānam udayabbayam  
 labhate<sup>123</sup> pitipāmojjam<sup>124</sup> amatam tam vijānatān ti. [Dhp 373–74]

<sup>101</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: pañcamachaṭthesu

<sup>102</sup>Mp-ṭ: avigatuppādādikhaṇṭattayam

<sup>103</sup>Mp-ṭ: abhāvitam

<sup>104</sup>Mp-ṭ: pañditasammatassa (for: pañditassa

sammataṁ)

<sup>105</sup>Mp-ṭ: asādhanato

<sup>106</sup>Mp-ṭ so

<sup>107</sup>Mp-ṭ: asādhento (for:

asādheti so)

<sup>108</sup>Mp-ṭ omits

<sup>109</sup>= Mp v.l.; Mp = Mp-ṭ: tesu

<sup>110</sup>Mp-ṭ:

-jjhānādīsu

<sup>111</sup>Mp-ṭ: -ppattam

<sup>112</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: cittam

<sup>113</sup>Mp-ṭ adds:

sattamaṭṭhamesu

<sup>114</sup>Mp-ṭ = Mp E<sup>e</sup>: akatan

<sup>115</sup>Mp-ṭ: -bahulikāravasena

<sup>116</sup>Mp-ṭ: dvisu

<sup>117</sup>Mp-ṭ: navame

<sup>118</sup>Mp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ (= Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958, N<sup>e</sup>

1976) so; Mp E<sup>e</sup>, C<sup>e</sup> 1923: āvahatī; cf. A I 6,14–15: dukkhādhivāham, Mp E<sup>e</sup> I

53,13: dukkhāvaham

<sup>119</sup>Mp-ṭ omits: \*tam adhibhavantum ... āharatī ti\*

<sup>120</sup>Mp-ṭ: -jjhāna-

<sup>121</sup>Mp-ṭ: -pañitataram

<sup>122</sup>Mp-ṭ: rati

<sup>123</sup>Mp-ṭ: labhatī

<sup>124</sup>Mp-ṭ: pīti-

tam hi cittam vissaṭṭha-indavajirasadisam amoghabhāvato.

Akammaniyavaggo tatiyo.<sup>125</sup>

[Adantavaggo catuttho]<sup>126</sup>

(1–2) <sup>127</sup>*adantan* [54,6] ti cittabhāvanāvidhinā<sup>128</sup> na dantam.  
*\*nibbisevanan* [56,9] ti samavipassanāmaggaphalavasena vigatam  
 visevanam.\*<sup>129</sup>

(3–4) \**agopitan* [56,13] ti sīlādivasena gopanabhāvena na  
 gopitam.\*<sup>130</sup> ten’ āha *satisaṁvararahitan* [54,13] ti. catutthe tatiye  
 vuttavipariyāyena attho veditabbo.

(5–6) <sup>131</sup>*purimasadiso evā*<sup>132</sup> [54,19] ti tatiyatutthasadiso eva.

(7–8) <sup>133</sup>*upamā pan’ etthā* [54,21] ti yathā paṭhamadīsu adanta-  
 hatthī<sup>134</sup>-assādayo upamābhāvena gahitā, evam ettha sattapaṭṭhamesu<sup>135</sup>  
*asamvutagharadvārādivasena*<sup>136</sup> *veditabbā* [54,21–22] ti vuttam.

(9–10) *catūhi*<sup>137</sup> *padehī* [54,23] ti adantadīhi catūhi padehi yojetvā  
 navadasamāni<sup>138</sup> suttāni vuttāni ti yojanā.

Adantovaggo catuttho.<sup>139</sup>

[Anathavaggo pañcamo]<sup>140</sup>

(1) \**upamā* va opamam, so eva attho, tasmiṁ bodhetabbo *nipāto*  
 [55,1]. *seyyathā pi* [55,1] ti yathā ti attho. *atthenā* [55,2] ti  
 upameyyatthena. attham paṭhamam vatvā pacchā upamam dassento  
*atthena upamam parivāretvā dasseti* [55,2] nāma, upamam pana

<sup>125</sup> = Mp-ṭ v.l. (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>, C<sup>e</sup> 1923); Mp-ṭ: Akammaniyavaggavaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

<sup>126</sup>This title is given in Mp-ṭ at the end of this chapter; Mp-ṭ IV. Adanta-  
 vaggavaṇṇanā <sup>127</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: catutthassa paṭhame <sup>128</sup>Mp-ṭ: cittabhāvanāya  
 vinā <sup>129</sup>Mp-ṭ omits: \*nibbisevanan ti ... visevanam.\* <sup>130</sup>Mp-ṭ omits:

\*agopitan ti ... na gopitam.\* <sup>131</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: pañcamachaṭthesu <sup>132</sup>Mp-ṭ (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>): yevā <sup>133</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: sattamatthamesu <sup>134</sup>Mp-ṭ: -hatthi- <sup>135</sup>Mp-ṭ:  
 sattamatthamesu, v.l.: sattamapaṭṭhamesu <sup>136</sup>= Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958, C<sup>e</sup> 1923, N<sup>e</sup>

1976; Mp E<sup>e</sup>: asamvutam ghara- <sup>137</sup>Mp-ṭ: navamadasamesu catūhi pi

<sup>138</sup>Mp-ṭ: navamadasamāni <sup>139</sup>A E<sup>e</sup>, Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958, N<sup>e</sup> 1976; Mp E<sup>e</sup>, C<sup>e</sup> 1923:  
 Dantavaggo catuttho; Mp-ṭ: Adantavaggavaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā <sup>140</sup>This title is  
 given in Mp-ṭ at the end of this chapter; Mp-ṭ: V. Pañihita-acchavagga-  
 vaṇṇanā

paṭhamam̄ vatvā pacchā attham̄ dassento upamāya attham̄ parivāretvā dasseti [55.4–5] nāma, tadubhayassa pi āgataṭṭhānam̄ nidassento Vatthasutte viyā [55.3] ti ādim āha.\*<sup>141</sup>

kaṇakasadiso<sup>142</sup> sāliphalassa bunde<sup>143</sup> uppajjanakavālo *sālisukam̄*<sup>144</sup> [55.9], tathā *yavasukam̄* [55.10]. sukassa tanūkabhbāvato<sup>145</sup> bhedavato bhedo nātimahā hotī ti āha *bhindissati*,<sup>146</sup> *chavi*<sup>147</sup> *chindissati* ti<sup>148</sup> attho [55.13] ti. yathā micchāṭhapitasālisukādi akkantam̄ pi hathādi<sup>149</sup> na bhindati bhinditum̄ ayoggabhāvena ṭhitattā, evam̄ ācayagāmicittam̄ avijjam̄ na bhindati bhinditum̄ ayoggabhāvena uppannattā ti imam̄ attham̄ dasseti *micchāṭhapitenā* [55.14] ti ādinā. *atṭhasu thānesū* [55.16] ti<sup>150</sup> dukkhādisaccesu<sup>151</sup> pubbantādisu<sup>152</sup> cā ti atṭhasu thānesu. *ghana-balahan*<sup>153</sup> [55.16] ti cirakālaparibhbāvanāya ativiya balaham̄. mahā-visyatāya mahāpaṭipakkhatāya bahuparivāratāya bahudukkhatāya ca mahatī avijjā ti mahā-avijjā. tam̄ *mahā-avijjam̄* [55.17]. *mahā-saddo* [55.17] hi bahubhbāvattho pi hoti mahājano ti ādisu<sup>154</sup> viya.<sup>155</sup> \*vijjhanti arahantamaggaññānam̄ ukkam̄sagativijjānanena,\*<sup>156</sup> *tañhāvānato nikkhantabhbāvenā* [55.19] ti tattha tanhāya abhbāvam̄ eva vadati.

**akkantan** ti ruļi hotī<sup>157</sup> ti āha *hatthena — pa — vuttan*<sup>158</sup> [55.25–56.1] ti. *ariyavohāro* [56.1] ti ariyadesavāsīnam̄ vohāro. mahantam̄

<sup>141</sup>This paragraph (\*upamā va opamam̄ ... ādim āha.\*) is in Mp-ṭ replaced with a much longer passage (Mp-ṭ E<sup>e</sup> 1998 II 40.1–52.5); the entire text of this addition is given in endnote (1) below (p. 96). This is a major difference between Mp-pṭ and Mp-ṭ in this chapter. <sup>142</sup>= Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ: kaṇakasadiso <sup>143</sup>= Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ : tuṇḍe (other vv.ll. thunde, kundē, phuṇḍe) <sup>144</sup> Mp-ṭ: (-)sūka- (for:(-)suka- (here and below)) <sup>145</sup> Mp-ṭ : tanu- <sup>146</sup> Mp E<sup>e</sup>: bhindissatī ti <sup>147</sup> Mp-ṭ = Mp E<sup>e</sup>: chaviṃ <sup>148</sup> Mp-ṭ: chindissatī ti <sup>149</sup> Mp-ṭ: -ādim; cf. Mp-ṭ v.l.: hatthādī <sup>150</sup> Mp-ṭ adds: dukkhe aññānam̄ ti [Dhs § 1061] ādinā vutttesu. Cf. Dhs § 1061: dukkhe aññānam̄ dukkhasamudaye aññānam̄ dukkhanirodhe aññānam̄ dukkhanirodhagāminiyā patipadāya aññānam̄ pubbante aññānam̄ aparante aññānam̄ pubbantāparante aññānam̄ idappaccayatā paṭiccasamuppannesu dhammesu aññānam̄ ... <sup>151</sup> Mp-ṭ: dukkhādīsu catūsu saccesu <sup>152</sup> Mp-ṭ: -ādīsu catūsu <sup>153</sup> Mp-ṭ (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>): -bahala- (here and below) <sup>154</sup> Mp-ṭ: -ādīsu <sup>155</sup> Cf. Vism-mhṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1960 I 452, 23–24 <sup>156</sup> Mp-ṭ omits: \*vijjhanti ... -gativijjānanena\* <sup>157</sup> Mp-ṭ: rūlhī h' esā (for: ruļi hotī) <sup>158</sup> Mp-ṭ: akkantan t' eva vuttan (for: hatthena — pa — vuttan [= hatthena uppīlitam̄, rūlhīsaddavasena pana akkantam̄ t' eva vuttan])

agahetvā<sup>159</sup> appamatthakass'<sup>160</sup> eva gahaṇe payojanam̄ dassetum̄ *kasmā panā* [56.1] ti ādi āraddhaṇ. tena: vivaṭṭupanissayakusalam̄<sup>161</sup> nāma yoniso uppāditam̄ appakan ti na cintetabbam̄, anukkamena laddha-paccayam̄ hutvā vaddhamānam̄<sup>162</sup> khuddakanadi<sup>163</sup> viya pakkhandā mahoghā<sup>164</sup> samuddam̄ anukkamena nibbānamahāsamuddam̄ eva purisam̄ pāpetī ti dīpeti.

(3) <sup>165</sup>*dosena padutṭhacittan* [56.21] ti sampayuttadhammānam̄ yasmiṇ̄ santāne uppajjati, tassa ca dussanena<sup>166</sup> visasaṃsaṭṭha-putimuttasadisenā<sup>167</sup> dosena padusitacittam̄.<sup>168</sup> *attano cittena* [56.22] ti attano cetopariyaññāṇena<sup>169</sup> sabbaññutaññāṇena vā sahitena cittena. *paricchinditvā* [56.22–23] ti ñāṇena paricchinditvā.

īṭṭhākārena etī ti ayo, sukham̄. sabbaso apeto ayo etassa etasmā ti vā apāyo [57.2], kāyikassa cetasikassa ca dukkhassa gati pavattiṭṭhānan ti *duggati* [57.3], kāraṇavasena<sup>170</sup> vividhapakārena<sup>171</sup> ca nipātiyanti etthā ti *vinipāto* [57.4], appako pi n' atthi ayo sukham̄ etthā ti *nirayo* [57.4] ti evam̄ ettha attho veditabbo.

(4) <sup>172</sup>*saddhāpasādena pasannan* [57.5] ti saddhāsaṅkhātena pasādena pasannam̄, na indriyānam̄ vippasannatāya.<sup>173</sup> *sukhassa gatin* [57.6] ti sukhassa pavattiṭṭhānam̄. sukhā ev' ettha gacchati<sup>174</sup> na dukkhan ti vā *sugati* [57.6]. manāpiyarūpāditāya saha aggehi ti *saggam̄, lokam̄*<sup>175</sup> [57.7].

(5) <sup>176</sup>*pariṭṭhāvūpasamakaro rahado* etthā ti rahado, udakapuṇṇo rahado.<sup>177</sup> udakam̄ rahati<sup>178</sup> dhāretī ti *udakarahado* [57.8].<sup>179</sup> *āvilo* [57.9] ti kalalabahūtāya<sup>180</sup> ākulo. ten' āha *avippasanno* [57.9] ti. *lulito*

<sup>159</sup> Mp-ṭ: aggahetvā <sup>160</sup> Mp-ṭ: appamatthakass' <sup>161</sup> Mp-ṭ: vivaṭṭū- <sup>162</sup> Mp-ṭ: vaddhamānam̄ <sup>163</sup> Mp-ṭ: -nadī <sup>164</sup> Mp-ṭ: pakkhandamahogho <sup>165</sup> Mp-ṭ adds: tatiye <sup>166</sup> Mp-ṭ: dūsanena <sup>167</sup> Mp-ṭ: -pūti- <sup>168</sup> Mp-ṭ: padūsita- <sup>169</sup> Mp-ṭ: -pariyaññāṇena; adds: attano <sup>170</sup> = Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ: kāraṇā- <sup>171</sup> Mp-ṭ: vividham̄ vikārena <sup>172</sup> Mp-ṭ adds: catutthe <sup>173</sup> Mp-ṭ: avippasannatāya <sup>174</sup> = Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ: gacchanti <sup>175</sup> Mp-ṭ (= A, Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958, C<sup>e</sup> 1923): saggam̄ lokam̄; Mp E<sup>e</sup>, N<sup>e</sup> 1976: sagga lokam̄ (for: saggam̄ lokam̄) <sup>176</sup> Mp-ṭ adds: pañcame <sup>177</sup> = Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ adds: *udakarahado* [57.8] <sup>178</sup> Mp-ṭ: dahati <sup>179</sup> Cf. Mp-ṭ: ... udakapuṇṇo rahado *udakarahado* [57.8]. udakam̄ dahati dhāretī ti *udakadaho* [57.8]. <sup>180</sup> Mp-ṭ: -bahulatāya

[57,10] ti vātēna ālolito.<sup>181</sup> ten' āha *aparisāñhito* [57,10] ti. vātābhīghātena vicitarañgamalasamākulatāya<sup>182</sup> parito na sañthito<sup>183</sup> *aparisāñhito* [57,10]. vātābhīghātena udukassa ca kalassa ca<sup>184</sup> appabhāvena *kalalibhūto* [57,11] kaddamabhāvapatto<sup>185</sup> ti āha *kaddamibhūto* [57,11] ti.

*sippiyo* [57,12] muttāsippiyādayo.<sup>186</sup> *sambukā* [57,12] sañkhāpanṇakavisesā.<sup>187</sup>

*carantam pi tiññhantam pī* [57,15] ti yathālābhavacanam etam datthabbañ. tam eva hi yathālābhavacanatam dassetum *etthā* [57,15] ti ādi vuttam.<sup>188</sup> *itaram pī* [57,20] ti itaram pi dvayam carantam pi tiññhantam pi vuttam.<sup>189</sup>

*pariyayonaddhenā*<sup>190</sup> [57,23] ti pañcchāditena. ta-y-idam kārañena āvilabhāvassa dassanam.

ditthadhamme imasmim attabhāve bhavo *ditthadhammiko* [57,24], so pana lokiyo pi hoti lokuttaro pī ti āha *lokiyalokuttaramissako* [57,24–25] ti. pecca sampādetabbato *samparāyo* [57,25–26], paraloko. ten' āha *so hi parattha-attho ti parattho* [57,26–58,1] ti. iti dvidhāpi sakasantati-pariyāpanno eva gahito ti itaram pi sañgahetvā dassetum *api cā* [58,2] ti ādim āha.

*ayan* [58,6] ti kusalakammapathasañkhāto dasavidho dhammo. *satthantarakappāvasāne* [58,7–8] ti idam tassa āsannabhāvam sandhāya vuttam. yassa kassa ci antarakappāvasāne<sup>191</sup> ti veditabbam.

*ariyānam yuttan* [58,11] ti ariyānam ariyabhāvāya yuttam, tato eva *ariyabhāvam*<sup>192</sup> kātum *samatthanam* [58,11–12]. ñāñam eva ñeyyassa paccakkhakaraññāthena dassanan ti āha ñāñam eva hī [58,13] ti ādi. kim

<sup>181</sup>Mp-ṭ: ālolito <sup>182</sup>Mp-ṭ vīci-, addis: hi <sup>183</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: vā <sup>184</sup>Mp-ṭ omits: kalassa ca <sup>185</sup>Mp-ṭ: -ppatto <sup>186</sup>= Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ: -sippi-ādayo ; Mp-ṭ add s : ka- <sup>187</sup>Mp-ṭ: sañkhasalākavisesā, vv.ll. -salākādayo visesā, sañkhasevālaka- <sup>188</sup>Mp-ṭ: āraddham <sup>189</sup>Mp-ṭ omits: *itaram pī* [57, 20] ti itaram pi dvayam carantam pi tiññhantam pi vuttam. (Here, *itaram pi dvayam* refers to *sippisambukam* and *macchagumbam*, see A I 9,8–9.) <sup>190</sup>Mp-ṭ: pariyon- <sup>191</sup>Mp-ṭ: antarakappass' āvasāne <sup>192</sup>Mp E<sup>e</sup>, B<sup>e</sup> 1958, C<sup>e</sup> 1923, N<sup>e</sup> 1976 add: vā

pana tan ti *dibbacakkhuññādi* [cf. 58,14–15].<sup>193</sup>

(6) <sup>194</sup>*accho*[58,17] ti tanuko. tanubhāvam eva hi sandhāya *abahalo* [58,17] ti vuttam. yasmā pasanno nāma accho eva<sup>195</sup> na bahalo, tasmā *pasanno*<sup>196</sup> [58,17] ti vuttam. *vippasanno* [58,18] ti visesena pasanno. so pana sammā pasanno nāma hotī ti āha *sutthu pasanno* [58,18] ti.

*anāvilo* [58,19] ti akāluso.<sup>197</sup> ten' āha *parisuddho* [58,19] ti ādi. sañkhakhuddakasevālam,<sup>198</sup> yam:

tilabījakan ti [cf. Abh 690]

pi<sup>199</sup> vuccati. *sevālan* [58,20] ti kaññikasevālam. *palākam*<sup>200</sup> [58,20] udakamalam.

cittassa āvilabhāvo nivarañahetuko<sup>201</sup> ti āha *anāvilenā ti pañca-nīvaranāvippamuttenā*<sup>202</sup> [58,21] ti.

(7) <sup>203</sup>*rukkhajātānī* [58,25] ti ettha jātasaddena padavanam<sup>204</sup> eva kātam yathā kosajatan<sup>205</sup> [cf. Abh 629–30; 811] ti āha *rukkhānam*<sup>206</sup> etam adhivacanan [58,25] ti.

*ko ci hi rukkho vanñena aggo hoti* [59,1–2] yathā tam rattacandanādi. *ko ci gandhena* [59,2] yathā tam gosisacandanaṁ.<sup>207</sup> *ko ci rasena* [59,2] khadirādi. *ko ci phuññhatāya*<sup>208</sup> [59,2] campakādi.

maggaphalāvahatāya vipassanāvasena *bhāvitam* [59,6] pi gahitam.

tattha tatth' eva sakhibhabbatam pāpuñāti ti<sup>209</sup> [A I 255,1–2]

vacanato *abhiññāpādakacatutthajhānacittam*<sup>210</sup> eva āvuso [59,9–10] ti Phussamittatthero.<sup>211</sup>

(8) <sup>212</sup>cittassa parivattanam uppādanirodho<sup>213</sup> evā ti āha *evaññam lahu*<sup>214</sup> *uppajjītvā lahu nirujjhakan* [59,11–12] ti.

<sup>193</sup>Mp-ṭ reads this sentence: kim pana tan ti āha *dibbacakkhu* [58, 14] ti ādi.

<sup>194</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: chañthe <sup>195</sup>Mp-ṭ omits <sup>196</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: ti pi vattatī <sup>197</sup>Mp-ṭ: akaluso <sup>198</sup>Mp-ṭ: *sañkhan* [58,20] ti khuddakasevālam <sup>199</sup>Mp-ṭ omits <sup>200</sup>=

Mp-ṭ v.l., Mp-ṭ: pañakan ; adds: ti <sup>201</sup>Mp-ṭ: *nīvarañā-* <sup>202</sup>Mp-ṭ (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>, C<sup>e</sup> 1923): -nīvarañāvippayuttenā <sup>203</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: sattame <sup>204</sup>Mp-ṭ: pada-

vāññhanam <sup>205</sup>Mp-ṭ: -jātan <sup>206</sup>Mp-ṭ (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>) adds: ev' <sup>207</sup>Mp-ṭ: gosīta-

candanaṁ <sup>208</sup>= Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958 v.l.; Mp-ṭ (= Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958, N<sup>e</sup> 1976): thaddhatāya; Mp E<sup>e</sup>: phaññatāya, C<sup>e</sup> 1923 thanñatāya <sup>209</sup>Mp-ṭ: pāpuñāti ti

<sup>210</sup>Mp-ṭ: -jjhāna- <sup>211</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: vadati <sup>212</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: aññame <sup>213</sup>= Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ: uppādanirodhā <sup>214</sup>Mp-ṭ (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>): lahūm (here and below)

*adhimattapamāṇatthe* [59,13] ti atikkantapamāṇatthe, pamāṇatitatāyan<sup>215</sup> ti attho. ten' āha *ativiya na sukarā* [59,13–14] ti.

*cakkhuññānam*<sup>216</sup> pi *adhippetam evā* [59,18] ti sabbassa pi cittassa samānakhaṇattā vuttam. cittassa ativiya lahuparivattibhāvam theravādena dipetum<sup>217</sup> *imasmiṃ pan’ atthe* [59,18–19] ti ādi vuttam. *cittasaṅkhārā* [59,21] ti sasampayuttam cittam vadati.<sup>218</sup> *adḍhacūlan* [59,22] ti thokena ūnaṁ upaḍḍham. kassa pana upaḍḍhan ti. adhikārato vāhassā ti viññāyati. adḍhacuddasan ti keci. adḍhacatutthan ti apare. sādhikadiyadḍhasatam<sup>219</sup> vāho<sup>220</sup> ti daļham katvā vadanti, tam<sup>221</sup> vīmamsitabbaṁ. catunāliko<sup>222</sup> *tumbo* [59,23].<sup>223</sup>

*pucchāya abhāvenā* [60,6] ti *sakkā pana bhante upamam*<sup>224</sup> kātun [60,5] ti evam pavattāya *pucchāya abhāvena na katā* [60,6–7] upamā. *dhammadesanāpariyosāne* [60,7] ti sannipatitaparisāya yathāraddhammadesanāya pariyosāne.

(9) <sup>225</sup>*pabhassaran* [60,9] ti pariyodātam sabhāvaparisuddhatthena. ten' āha *pañdaram parisuddhan* [60,9] ti. pabhassaratādayo nāma vanṇadhātuyam labbhamānakavisesā<sup>226</sup> ti āha *kim pana cittassa vanṇo nāma atthī ti* [60,11]. itaro arūpatāya *n’ atthī* [60,11] ti paṭikkhipetvā<sup>227</sup> pariyāyakathā ayam tādisassa cittassa parisuddhabhāvaparidīpanāyā<sup>228</sup> ti dassento *nilādin*<sup>229</sup> [cf. 60,11–12] ti ādim āha. tathā hi:

so evam samāhite citte parisuddhe pariyodāte ti [D I 76,13 foll.]

<sup>215</sup>Mp-ṭ: -ātīta- <sup>216</sup>Mp-ṭ (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>): cakkhuviññānam <sup>217</sup>Mp-ṭ: dīpetum  
<sup>218</sup>Here Mp-ṭ adds a passage in which vāhasatānam kho mahārāja vīhīnam [Mp I 59, 22 = Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958, C<sup>e</sup> 1923, N<sup>e</sup> 1976] is discussed (cf. Mp-ṭ II 58,5–11). For details, see endnote (2) below. <sup>219</sup>Mp-ṭ: sādhikam diyadḍhasatam<sup>220</sup>= Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ: vāhā <sup>221</sup>Mp-ṭ omits <sup>222</sup>Mp-ṭ: catunāliko <sup>223</sup>Cf. Mil-ṭ 22, 23–26 (ad Mil 102,1–14): ettha sād[h]ikadiya[d]jhavāhāsatam thokena ud[dh ?]jam upa[d]jhavāhā-satassa patanālike tumbo Ti Aṅgutta[ra]śīkā vuttā. a[d]jhacūlan ti vāhassa tassa a[d]jhādhikā vāhavi(t)hī ti vattum vattati yeva; cf. also Mil-ṭ 23, 4 foll. Mil-ṭ 22, n. 7 cites Mp V 61,21–62,2, but Mp-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1961 III 349,9–17, which comments upon this passage, is different from the above citation in Mil-ṭ ascribed to Aṅguttara-tīkā. On measures in Pāli see also Bhikkhu Nānamoli, 1994, pp. 140–41. <sup>224</sup>Mp E<sup>e</sup>: upamā <sup>225</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: navame <sup>226</sup>Mp-ṭ: labbhanakavisesā <sup>227</sup>Mp-ṭ: pitvā <sup>228</sup>Mp-ṭ: parisuddhabhāvanādīpanāyā <sup>229</sup>Mp-ṭ (= Mp E<sup>e</sup>): nilādīnan [60,11–12]

vuttam. ten' ev' āha *idam pi nirupakkilesatāya parisuddhan ti pabhassaran* [60,13–14] ti. kiṁ pana bhavaṅgacittam nirupakkilesan ti. āma, sabhāvato nirupakkilesam āgantukam upakkilesam,<sup>230</sup> āgantuka-upakkilesavasena pana siyā upakkiliṭṭham. ten' āha *tañ ca kho* [60,15] ti ādi. tattha attano tesañ ca bhikkhūnam paccakkhabhāvato pubbe **idan** ti vatvā idāni paccāmasanavasena *tan* [60,15] ti āha. *ca*-saddo [60,15] attupanayane.<sup>231</sup> *kho*-saddo [60,15] vacanālāñkāre avadhāraṇe vā. vakkhamānassa athassa nicchitabhbāvato<sup>232</sup> bhavaṅgacittena sahāvatīthānābhāvato upakkilesānam āgantukatā ti āha *asahajātehī* [60,16] ti ādi.

rāgādayo upecca cittasantānam kilisanti<sup>233</sup> vibādhenti upatāpenti cā ti āha *upakkilesehī ti rāgādīhī* [60,18] ti. bhavaṅgacittassa nippariyāyato upakkilesehi upakkiliṭṭhatā nāma n’ atthi asāmsatthabhbāvato, eka-santatipariyāpannatāya pana siyā upakkiliṭṭhatāpariyāyato<sup>234</sup> ti āha *upakkiliṭṭham* nāma ti vuccati<sup>235</sup> [60,19] ti. idāni tam attham upamāya vibhāvitum<sup>236</sup> yathā hī [60,20] ti ādim āha. tena bhinnasantānagatāya pi nāma iriyāya loke gārayhatā paṭidissati,<sup>237</sup> pageva ekasantānagatāya iriyāyā ti imam visesam dasseti. ten' āha *javanakkhaṇe — pa*<sup>238</sup> — *upakkiliṭṭham* nāma hotī [60,28–61,2] ti.

(10) <sup>239</sup>*bhavaṅgacittam eva cittan* [61,3] ti **pabhassaram idam bhikkhave cittan** ti vuttam bhavaṅgacittam eva cittam.<sup>240</sup> yadaggena bhavaṅgacittam tādisapaccayasamavāye upakkiliṭṭham nāma ti<sup>241</sup> vuccati, tadaggena tabbidhurapaccayasamavāye upakkilesato vippamuttan<sup>242</sup> ti vuccati. ten' āha *upakkilesehi vippamuttam* nāma hotī

<sup>230</sup>Mp-ṭ omits: āgantukam upakkilesam <sup>231</sup>Mp-ṭ: atthūpanayane <sup>232</sup>Cf.: nicayita- <sup>233</sup>Mp-ṭ kilesenti; vv.ll.: kilesanti, kilissanti <sup>234</sup>Mp-ṭ: -pariyāyo <sup>235</sup>Cf. Mp E<sup>e</sup>, C<sup>e</sup> 1923: ... rāgādīhi. upakilitthan ti upakkiliṭṭham nāma ti vuccati; Mp B<sup>e</sup> 1958, N<sup>e</sup> 1976: ... rāgādīhi upakkiliṭṭhattā ti upakkiliṭṭham nāma ti vuccati <sup>236</sup>Mp-ṭ: vibhāvetum <sup>237</sup>= Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ dissati <sup>238</sup>Mp-ṭ: pe <sup>239</sup>Mp-ṭ adds: dasame <sup>240</sup>Mp-ṭ omits <sup>241</sup>Mp-ṭ: nāma <sup>242</sup>= Mp-ṭ v.l.; Mp-ṭ: vimuttan

[61.6-7] ti. sesam ettha navamasutte vuttanayānusārena veditabbam.

Anatthavaggo pañcamo.<sup>242</sup>

ENDNOTES:

(1) [See Part II, 2, p. 90, n. 140 above]

pañcamassa pañhame upamā va opammañ, so eva attho opammattho,<sup>243</sup> tasmiñ *opammatthe* [55.1] bodhetabbe *nipāto* [55.1]. *seyyathā pī* [55.1] ti yathā ti attho. ettha ca:

*tatra bhagavā kattha ci atthena upamañ parivāretvā dasseti Vatthasutte viya, Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisuttesu viya ca. kattha ci upamāya attham parivāretvā dasseti Loñambilasutte viya Suvaññakārasatta<sup>244</sup>-Suriyopamādisuttesu<sup>245</sup> viya ca. imasmiñ pana sālisūkopame upamāya attham parivāretvā dassento: seyyathāpi bhikkhave ti ādim āhā ti [Mp E<sup>e</sup> I 55.2-8]*

potthakesu likhanti, tam Majjhimañthakathāya Vatthasutta-vanñanāya na sameti. tattha hi idam vuttam:

seyyathā pi bhikkhave vatthan ti bhikkhave yathā vattham, upamāvacanam ev' etam. upamañ karonto ca bhagavā kattha ci pañhamam yeva upamañ<sup>246</sup> dassetvā pacchā attham dasseti, kattha ci pañhamam attham dassetvā pacchā upamam, kattha ci upamāya attham parivāretvā dasseti, kattha ci atthena upamañ. tathā h' esa:

seyyathā pi-ssu<sup>247</sup> bhikkhave dve agārā sadvārā, tattha cakkhumā puriso majjhe ṭhito passeyyā ti [M III 178,21-22]

sakalam pi Devadūtasuttañ upamañ pañhamam dassetvā pacchā attham dassento āha.

tirokuḍḍam tiropākāram tiropabbatañ asajjamāno gacchati seyyathā pi ākāse ti [D I 78.3-4]

<sup>242</sup>Mp-ṭ: Pañihita-acchavaggavaññanā niññitā ; Mp E<sup>e</sup>: Pañcamo vaggo ; A : Pañihita-acchanna-vaggo pañcamo (vv. ll.: Vaggo pañcamo, Pañihita-accha-vaggo pañcamo) <sup>243</sup>Mp-ṭ v.l. omits <sup>244</sup>Mp-ṭ so; Mp E<sup>e</sup>, B<sup>e</sup> 1958, C<sup>e</sup> 1923, N<sup>e</sup> 1976: -kārasutta <sup>245</sup>Mp: -Suriyopamādisu suttesu <sup>246</sup>Mp-ṭ so; Ps E<sup>e</sup>: upamañ pañhamam yeva *for*: pañhamam yeva upamañ ; Mp-ṭ v.l.: upamañ yeva *for*: yeva upamañ <sup>247</sup>Mp-ṭ so; M : pi ; Ps: p' assu

ādinā pana nayena sakalam pi iddhividham attham pañhamam dassetvā pacchā upamañ dassento āha.

seyyathā pi brāhmaṇa puriso sāratthiko sāragavesī ti [M I 198,20]

ādinā nayena sakalam pi Cūlañāropamasuttam<sup>248</sup> upamāya attham parivāretvā dassento āha.

idha pana bhikkhave ekacce kulaputtā dhammam pariyanūnti suttañ ... pe ... seyyathā pi bhikkhave puriso alagaddatthiko ti [M I 134,5-16]

ādinā nayena sakalam pi Alagaddasuttam Mahāñāropamasuttan ti evam ādīni suttāni atthena upamañ parivāretvā dassento āha. svāyam idha pañhamam upamañ dassetvā pacchā attham dassetī ti. [cf. Ps I 165,28-66,18]

ettha hi Cūlañāropamādīsu pañhamam upamañ vatvā tadanantaram upameyyattham vatvā puna upamañ vadanto: upamāya attham parivāretvā dassetī ti vutto. Alagaddasuttādīsu<sup>249</sup> pana attham pañhamam vatvā tadanantaram upamañ vatvā puna attham vadanto: atthena upamañ parivāretvā dassetī ti vutto. tena Vatthasutta-Līnatthappakāsiniyam vuttam:

upameyyattham pañhamam<sup>250</sup> vatvā tadanantaram attham vatvā puna upamañ vadanto :

"upamāya attham parivāretvā dassetī" [Ps I 166,2] ti vutto.

"atthena upamañ parivāretvā" [cf. Ps I 166,2-3] ti

ethāpi es' eva nayo ti. [cf. Ps-ṭ Be 1961 I 268,19-21]<sup>251</sup>

idha pana *kattha ci atthena upamañ parivāretvā dasseti Vatthasutte viya Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisuttesu viya cā* [55,2-4] ti vuttam.

<sup>248</sup>Mp-ṭ so; Ps : Culla-

<sup>249</sup>Mp-ṭ Be 1958: Alagaddūpamasuttādīsu <sup>250</sup>Ps-ṭ

B<sup>e</sup> 1961 (= Mp-ṭ v.l.) adds: upamañ <sup>251</sup>Ps-ṭ Be 1961 I 268,19-21 reads:

"atthan" ti upamiyattham. pañhamam upamañ vatvā tadanantaram attham vatvā puna upamañ vadanto: "upamāya attham parivāretvā dassetī" ti. "atthena upamañ parivāretvā" ti ethāpi es' eva nayo. In Mp-ṭ *atthena upamañ parivāretvā* is taken as a citation from Mp I 55, 2, but this is clearly a citation from Ps I 166,2-3 where the reading is *atthena upamañ* and *parivāretvā* is implied.

tathā Vatthasutte tāvā:

seyyathā pi bhikkhave vattham saṅkiliṭṭham malaggahitam, tam enam rajako yasmiṃ yasmiṃ raṅgajāte upasamhareyya, yadi nīlakāya, yadi pītakāya, yadi lohitakāya, yadi mañjiṭṭhakāya, durattavaṇṇam ev’ assa, aparisuddhavaṇṇam ev’ assa. tam kissa hetu. aparisuddhattā bhikkhave vatthassa. evam eva kho bhikkhave citte saṅkiliṭṭhe duggati pāṭīkaṅkhā ti [M I 36.15–21]

ādinā paṭhamam upamam dassetvā pacchā upameyyattho vutto; na pana paṭhamam attham vatvā tadanantaram upamam dassetvā puna attho vutto, yena *kattha ci atthena upamam parivāretvā dasseti Vatthasutte viyā* [55.2–3] ti vadeyya.

tathā Pāricchattakopame pi:

yasmiṃ bhikkhave samaye devānam Tāvatiṃsānam pāricchattako koviļāro paṇḍupalāso hoti, attamanā bhikkhave devā Tāvatiṃsā tasmīm samaye honti: paṇḍupalāso dāni pāricchattako koviļāro, na cirass’ eva dāni pannapalāso<sup>252</sup> bhavissati … pe … evam eva kho bhikkhave yasmiṃ samaye ariyasāvako agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajjāya ceteti, paṇḍupalāso bhikkhave ariyasāvako tasmīm samaye hotī ti [A IV 117.5–18.16]

ādinā paṭhamam upamam dassetvā pacchā attho vutto.

Aggikkhandhopame:

passatha no tumhe bhikkhave amum mahantam aggikkhandham ādittam sampajjalitam sajotibhūtan ti. evam bhante ti. tam kiṃ maññatha bhikkhave katamam nu kho varam yam amum mahantam aggikkhandham ādittam sampajjalitam sajotibhūtam alingetvā upanisīdeyya vā upanipajjeyya vā, yam khattiyakaññam vā brāhmaṇakaññam vā gahapatikaññam vā mudutalunahatthapādaṃ alingetvā upanisīdeyya vā upanipajjeyya vā ti [A IV 128.7–15]

ādinā paṭhamam yeva dassetvā pacchā attho vutto, na pana paṭhamam attham vatvā tadanantaram upamam dassetvā puna attho vutto. tasmā *kattha ci atthena upamam parivāretvā dasseti*

<sup>252</sup>Mp-ṭ vv.ll.: sinarāpalāso, sītapalāso, khīṇapalāso, chinnapalāso; A : satta-palāso (Mp IV 58.3: sannapalāso ti patitopalāso)

Vatthasutte viya Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisutesu viya cā [55.2–4] ti na vattabbam.

keci pan’ ettha evam vanṇayanti:

attham paṭhamam vatvā pacchā ca<sup>253</sup> upamam dassento atthena upamam parivāretvā dasseti [55.2] nāma, upamam pana paṭhamam vatvā pacchā attham dassento upamāya attham parivāretvā dasseti [55.4–5] nāma, tadubhayassa pi āgataṭṭhānam nidassento Vatthasutte viyā [55.3] ti ādim āhā ti. [cf. Anathavagga (Mp-ṭ), par. (1) above<sup>254</sup>]

tam pi *kattha ci atthena upamam parivāretvā dasseti Vatthasutte viya Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisutesu viya cā* [55.2–4] ti vattabbam, evañ ca vuccamāne *kattha ci upamāya attham parivāretvā dasseti Loṇambilasutte viyā* [55.4–5] ti visum na vattabbam Aggikkhandhopamādisutesu viyā [55.3–4] ti ettha ādisadden’ eva saṅgahitattā.

Loṇambilasutte pi hi:

seyyathā pi bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto<sup>255</sup> kusalo sūdo rājānam vā rājamahāmattam vā nānaccayehi<sup>256</sup> sūpehi paccupaṭṭhito assa ambilaggehi pi tittakaggehi pi kaṭukaggehi pi madhuraggehi pi khārikehi pi akhārikehi pi loṇikehi pi aloṇikehi pi.

sa kho so bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto kusalo sūdo sakassa bhattassa nimittam uggaṇhāti: idam vā me ajja bhattasūpeyyam ruccati, imassa vā abhiharati, imassa vā bahum gaṇhāti, imassa vā vanṇam bhāsatī. ambilaggam vā me ajja bhattasūpeyyam ruccati, ambilaggassa vā abhiharati, ambilaggassa vā bahum gaṇhāti, ambilaggassa vā vanṇam bhāsatī … pe … aloṇikassa vā vanṇam bhāsatī ti.

sa kho so bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto kusalo sūdo lābhī c’ eva hoti acchādanassa, lābhī vetanassa, lābhī abhihārānam. tam kissa hetu. tathā hi so bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto kusalo sūdo sakassa bhatta-nimittam uggaṇhāti.

evam eva kho bhikkhave idh’ ekacco paṇḍito byatto kusalo

<sup>253</sup>Mp-ṭ so; Mp-ṭ v.l. (= Mp-ṭ) omits <sup>254</sup>This passage, here ascribed to *keci*, is clearly a citation from Mp-ṭ; see the beginning of Anathavaggo pañcamo above. <sup>255</sup>Mp-ṭ v.l.: viyatto (here and below) <sup>256</sup>Mp-ṭ v.l.: nānagoggarasehi

bhikkhu kāye kāyānupassī viharati ... pe ... vedanāsu ... pe ... citte ... pe ... dhammesu dhammānupassī viharati ātāpī sampajāno satimā vineyya loke abhijjhādomanassam. tassa dhammesu dhammānupassino viharato cittam samādhiyati, upakkilesā pahīyanti. so tam nimittam uggañhāti.

sa kho bhikkhave paññito byatto kusalo bhikkhu lābhī c' eva hoti ditth' eva dhamme sukhavihārānam, lābhī hoti satisampajaññassa. tam kissa hetu. tathā hi so bhikkhave paññito byatto kusalo bhikkhu sakassa cittassa nimittam uggañhātī ti. [S V 151.5–52.10]

evam paññamam upamam dassetvā pacchā attho vutto.

*Suvañṇakāra-Suriyopamādisuttesu* viya cā [cf. 55.5–6] ti idañ ca udāharañamattena saṅgaham gacchatī Suvañṇakārasuttādīsu paññamam upamāya adassitattā. etesu hi Suvañṇakāropamasutte tāvā:

adhicittam anuyuttēna bhikkhave bhikkhunā tīṇi nimittāni kālena kālam manasi kātabbāni, kālena kālam samādhinimittam manasi kātabbam, kālena kālam paggahanimittam manasi kātabbam, kālena kālam upekkhānimittam manasi kātabbam.

sace bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantam samādhinimittam yeva manasi kareyya, thānam tam cittam kosajjāya samvatteyya. sace bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantam paggahanimittam yeva manasi kareyya, thānam tam cittam uddhaccāya samvatteyya. sace bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantam upekkhānimittam yeva manasi kareyya, thānam tam cittam na sammā samādhiyeyya āsavānam khayāya. yato ca kho bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu kālena kālam samādhinimittam ... pe ... paggahanimittam ... pe ... upekkhānimittam manasi karoti, tam hoti cittam muduñ ca kammaniyañ<sup>257</sup> ca pabhassarañ ca, na ca pabhañgu, sammā samādhiyati āsavānam khayāya.

seyyathā pi bhikkhave suvañṇakāro vā suvañṇakārantevāsī vā ukkam bandhati, ukkam bandhitvā ukkāmukham ālimpeti, ukkāmukham ālimpetvā sañḍāsenā jātarūpam gahetvā ukkāmukhe

<sup>257</sup> A : kammaniyañ

pakkhipitvā kālena kālam abhidhamati, kālena kālam udakena paripphoseti, kālena kālam ajjhupekkhati. sace bhikkhave suvañṇakāro vā suvañṇakārantevāsī vā tam jātarūpam ekantam abhidhameyya, thānam tam jātarūpam daheyya. sace bhikkhave suvañṇakāro vā suvañṇakārantevāsī vā tam jātarūpam ekantam udakena paripphoseyya, thānam tam jātarūpam nibbāpeyya.<sup>258</sup> sace bhikkhave suvañṇakāro vā suvañṇakārantevāsī vā tam jātarūpam ekantam ajjhupekkheyya, thānam tam jātarūpam na sammā paripākam gaccheyya. yato ca kho bhikkhave suvañṇakāro vā suvañṇakārantevāsī vā tam jātarūpam kālena kālam abhidhamati, kālena kālam udakena paripphoseti, kālena kālam ajjhupekkhati, tam hoti jātarūpam muduñ ca kammaniyañ ca pabhassarañ ca, na ca pabhañgu, sammā upeti kammāya. yassā yassā ca piñandhanavikatiyā ākañkhati, yadi paññikāya yadi kuñdalāya yadi gīveyyakena<sup>259</sup> yadi suvañṇamālāya, tañ c' assa attham anubhoti.

evam eva kho bhikkhave adhicittam anuyuttēna bhikkhunā ... pe ... sammā samādhiyati āsavānam khayāya. yassa yassa ca abhiññā-sacchikarañiyassa dhammassa cittam abhininnāmeti abhiññā-sacchikiriyāya, tatra tatr' eva sakkhibabbatam pāpuñāti sati sati āyatane ti. [A I 256,29–58,15]

evam paññamam attham dassetvā tadanantaram upamam vatvā puna pi attho vutto.

sattasuriyopame ca:

aniccā bhikkhave sañkhārā, adhuvā bhikkhave sañkhārā, anassāsikā bhikkhave sañkhārā, yāvañ c' idam bhikkhave alam eva sabba-sañkhāresu nibbinditum alam virajjitum alam vimuccitum. Sineru bhikkhave pabbatarājā caturāsītiyojanasahassāni āyāmena caturāsītiyojanasahassāni vitthārena caturāsītiyojanasahassāni mahāsamudde ajjhogālho caturāsītiyojanasahassāni mahāsamuddā accuggato. hoti so kho<sup>260</sup> bhikkhave samayo, yam kadā ci karaha ci dīghassa addhuno accayena<sup>261</sup> bahūni vassāni bahūni vassasatāni bahūni vassasahassāni bahūni vassasatasahassāni devo na vassati, deve kho pana bhikkhave

<sup>258</sup> A v.l.: nibbāyeyya <sup>259</sup> A : gīveyyake <sup>260</sup> A : kho so (for : so kho) <sup>261</sup> A : (= Mp-ṭ v.l.) omits: kadā ci karaha ci dīghassa addhuno accayena

avassante ye keci 'me bījagāmabhūtagāmā<sup>262</sup> osadhitiṇavanappatayo, te ussussanti visussanti<sup>263</sup> na bhavanti. evam aniccā bhikkhave saṅkhārā, evam adhuvā bhikkhave saṅkhārā, evam anassāsikā bhikkhave saṅkhārā ti [A IV 100,5–18]

ādinā paṭhamam attham dassetvā tadanantaram upamam vatvā puna pi attho vutto.

atha vā.<sup>264</sup>

suriyassa bhikkhave udayato etam pubbaṅgamam etam pubbanimittam, yad idam aruṇuggam. evam eva kho bhikkhave bhikkhuno ariyassa aṭṭhaṅgikassa maggassa uppādāya etam pubbaṅgamam etam pubbanimittam, yad idam kalyāṇamittatā ti [S V 29,27–30,3]

yad etam Samyuttanikāye āgatam, tam idha Suriyopamasuttan ti adhippetam siyā. tam pi *kattha ci upamāya attham parivāretvā dasseti* [55,4–5] ti iminā na sameti paṭhamam upamam vatvā tadanantaram attham dassetvā puna upamāya avuttattā. paṭhamam eva hi tattha upamā dassitā, *imasmiṃ pana sālisūkopame upamāya attham parivāretvā dassento seyyathā pi bhikkhave ti ādim āhā* [55,7–8] ti idam pi vacanam asaṅgahitam Vatthasuttassa imassa ca visesābhāvato. ubhayatthāpi hi paṭhamam upamam dassetvā pacchā attho vutto, tasmā evam etha pāṭhena bhavitabbam:

tatra bhagavā kattha ci paṭhamam yeva upamam<sup>265</sup> dassetvā pacchā attham dasseti Vatthasutte viya Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisutesu viya ca, kattha ci atthena upamam parivāretvā dasseti Suvaṇṇakāra-Sattasuriyopamādisutesu viya, imasmīm pana sālisūkopame paṭhamam upamam dassetvā pacchā attham dassento seyyathā pi bhikkhave ti ādim āhā ti. [cf. Mp I 55,2–8]

aññathā Majjhimaṭṭhakathāya [Ps I 165,28–66,18] virujjhati. idhāpi ca pubbenāparam na sameti. Majjhimaṭṭhakathāya vuttanayen' eva vā idhāpi pāṭho gahetabbo. [cf. Mp-ṭ II 40,1–52,5]

<sup>262</sup> A : -bhūtagāma-

<sup>263</sup> A : vissussanti

<sup>264</sup> Mp-ṭ omits

<sup>265</sup> Mp-ṭ v.l.: upamam yeva (for: yeva upamam)

(2) [see Part II, 2, p. 94, n. 217 above]

vāhasatānāŋ<sup>266</sup> kho mahārāja vīhīnan [59,22] ti potthakesu likhanti,

vāhasataṁ kho mahārāja vīhīnan ti [Mil 102,10–11; cf. Mil-ṭ 22,19–26]

pana pāṭhena bhavitabbam. Milindapañhe pi hi kattha ci ayam eva pāṭho dissati. vāhasatānāŋ [59,22] ti vā paccatte sāmivacanam byattayena vuttan ti daṭṭhabbam. [cf. Mp-ṭ II 58,5–11]

### 3. Mp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ: Differences and similarities

The above three chapters from Mp-ṭ and their parallels from Mp-ṭ are relatively short and final conclusions will be drawn only after a critical edition of the entire manuscript of Mp-ṭ is completed. However, the differences and similarities between the two *ṭīkās* nevertheless seem to agree to a great extent with the description of the old and later *ṭīkās* in Saddhamma-s.<sup>267</sup>

Although the texts from Mp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ given in Part II, 2 are sometimes identical or very similar, the later *ṭīkā* (Mp-ṭ) is in many respects very different from the old one (Mp-ṭ). As stated above (Part II, 1) the text on the first few folios of the newly discovered manuscript of Mp-ṭ is exactly the same (with minor orthographic differences) as in the other three “old” *ṭīkās* (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ) and in this respect differs considerably from Mp-ṭ. This is a very strong indication that the manuscript of Mp-ṭ discussed here really belongs to the old *Līnatthappakāsinī* set. The later *ṭīkā* (Mp-ṭ) has several additions, corrections or omissions.

In Mp-ṭ three kinds of additions can be found:

(1) Some additions are used to clarify the structure of the text; such additions are usually in the beginning of the *ṭīkā* on a particular *sutta* from a particular *vagga* where the numbers of that *sutta* and *vagga* are

<sup>266</sup> = Mp E<sup>e</sup>, B<sup>e</sup> 1958, C<sup>e</sup> 1923, N<sup>e</sup> 1976; Mil E<sup>e</sup>, B<sup>e</sup> 1982, N<sup>e</sup> 1979 (= Mp N<sup>e</sup> v.l.); vāhasataṁ

<sup>267</sup> See Part I, 1.1 above (especially nn. 18–21).

added. For example, in Part II, p. 87, n. 90, where in Mp-ṭ *tatiyassa* [vaggassa] *pāthame* [sutte] is added before *abhāvitān ti*.<sup>268</sup>

(2) Some additions are further clarifications of already existing explanations.<sup>269</sup>

(3) Some additions are explanations of additional words from Mp that are not included in Mp-pt.<sup>270</sup>

Among the corrections<sup>271</sup> of the old *tīkā* (Mp-pt) found in Mp-ṭ the most important is a long passage<sup>272</sup> that thoroughly analyses and corrects both the Mp-pt (the first paragraph of *Anatthavagga*)<sup>273</sup> and a passage from Mp that the old *tīkā* (Mp-pt) comments upon. At the end it also suggests a better reading for the passage from Mp<sup>274</sup> which the old *tīkā* (Mp-pt) does not explain properly. This correction is much longer than the first paragraph of *Anatthavagga* that it replaces. It is very interesting to note that Mp-ṭ cites, among many canonical and postcanonical texts, including Ps and Ps-pt, also the first paragraph of *Anatthavagga* from Mp-pt (i.e. the passage that it replaces) and introduces it with: *keci pan’ ettha evam vannayanti*.<sup>275</sup> This is very significant because Ps-pt, for example, is introduced with: *tena Vatthasutta-Līnatthappakāśiniyam vuttam*,<sup>276</sup> but a passage from Mp-pt — another *tīkā* from the same *Līnatthappakāśinī* set — is simply ascribed to “some” (*keci*). Sāriputta of

<sup>268</sup> Similarly also Part II, nn. 98, 101, 113, 127, etc. Such additions are very common in Mp-ṭ — and this is also perhaps one of the reasons why in Saddhamma-s the later *tīkās* are described as “clear, not confused” (*anākula*).

<sup>269</sup> See, for example, Part II, 2, nn. 150–51; also nn. 177–79.

<sup>270</sup> See Part II, 2, n. 218 and endnote (2); this addition is obviously explaining another “version” (*bhāsantara*?) of Mil cited in Mp.

<sup>271</sup> See Part II, 2, nn. 94, 141, 179, 193.

<sup>272</sup> Part II, 2, p. 96, endnote (1) = Mp-ṭ II 40,1–52,5.

<sup>273</sup> See Part II, 2, n. 141, and endnote (1).

<sup>274</sup> Cf. Mp E<sup>e</sup> I 55,2–8 and the corrected version of this passage at the end of endnote (1) in Part II, 2.

<sup>275</sup> Mp-ṭ II 55,2–8, cf. Part II, 2, n. 141 and endnote (1).

<sup>276</sup> Mp-ṭ II 42,10.

Poñonnaruva, to whom Mp-ṭ is ascribed,<sup>277</sup> obviously considered this passage from Mp-pt to be one of the versions maintained by “some” (*keci*).<sup>278</sup>

In Mp-ṭ certain passages from Mp-pt are omitted; some of these passages<sup>279</sup> should perhaps be included in Mp-ṭ and the reasons for their omission are not clear. However, they do not seem to be as significant as the additions and corrections discussed above.

The above comparison shows that the later *tīkā* (Mp-ṭ) is better organized (*anākula*) and more comprehensive (*paripūṇa*) than the old one (Mp-pt).<sup>280</sup>

### Conclusion

From the above discussion of the *nikāya-tīkās*, their manuscripts and printed editions — with special emphasis on the two *Ānguttara-tīkās* (Mp-pt and Mp-ṭ; see Part I, 2.2 and Part II) — we can conclude that it is most probable that two different sets of *nikāya-tīkās* were in fact compiled: the older set called *Līnatthapakāśinī* (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt) and the later set called *Sāratthamañjūśā* (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mp-ṭ). Although the two complete sets are mentioned only in Saddhamma-s (and in the much later *CPD*, see Part I, Table I), all the eight *tīkās* from the two sets seem to still exist (see Part I, Table II) either in printed editions (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-ṭ, see Part I, 2.1) or in manuscript form (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mp-pt, see Part I, 2.2–3). The manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ and Mp-pt discussed in Part I, 2.2–3<sup>281</sup>

<sup>277</sup> Pecenko, 1997, pp. 165–66; *HPL*, p. 173, § 375.

<sup>278</sup> Cf. Saddhamma-s 61,13–14; Sp-ṭ B<sup>e</sup> 1960 29–10.

<sup>279</sup> See Part II, 2, nn. 119, 129, 130, 189.

<sup>280</sup> This comparison is of course very limited and it is not clear how “incomplete” (*aparipūṇa*) the original Mp-pt actually was. The Burmese manuscript of Mp-pt discussed above contains only the first three *nipātas* with many longer omissions (see Part I, 2.2 and Part II, 1) and the manuscript listed in *Pit-sm* (1989) nos. 199–201 also contains the first three *nipātas* only (see Part I, 1.6).

<sup>281</sup> Although all the manuscripts of three later *nikāya-tīkās* (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ) are

have never been investigated and it seems that they have been neglected by both the Theravāda tradition<sup>282</sup> and modern Pāli scholarship.<sup>283</sup>

held in Sri Lanka (see Part I, 2.3), there is among them also a Burmese manuscript of Ps-ṭ (LPP, vol. 1, p. 71, temple no. 326) which indicates that these *ṭīkās* were used in Burma as well.

It is possible that more manuscripts of these *ṭīkās* are still extant, most probably in Theravāda countries. According to U Nyunt Maung, Manuscript Consultant, Universities Historical Research Centre, University of Rangoon, “there are still many uncatalogued manuscripts of Pāli *ṭīkās* in temple libraries in Burma” (personal communication, Rangoon, December 1999).

<sup>282</sup> It is not made explicit why certain *ṭīkās* (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mp-pt) were ignored by the Theravāda tradition (see e.g. Chatthasaṅgāyana editions) and only some (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) were published — in spite of the fact that the manuscripts of the unpublished *ṭīkās* are held in different libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka and according to the introduction in the Chatthasaṅgāyana editions “all the existing *ṭīkās*” were collected and compared (see n. 80 above). In the *Nidānakathā* of Mp-t B<sup>e</sup> 1961 (p. ca) it is clearly stated that all the existing *ṭīkās* in Burma and outside Burma were edited and published:

evam saṅgītim āropitassa pana tepiṭakassa buddhavacanassa attha-saṃvaṇṇanābhūtā yā ca aṭṭhakathāyo saṃvijjanti yā ca tāsam atthappakāsanavasena pavattā ṭīkāyo samvijjanti manoramāya tantinayānuccavikāya bhāsāya ācariy’ Ānanda-ācariya-Dhammapālādīhi theravarehi katā,

tāsam pi aṭṭhakathāṭīkānam sadesīyamūlehi c’ eva videsīyamūlehi ca samsandityā tepiṭakassa viya buddhavacanassa visodhanapaṭivisodhanavasena mahātherā pāvacanadassino saṃvaṇṇanākovidā pāṭhasodhanam akāmsu,

icc evam aṭṭhakathāṭīkāyo pamādakhalitādhikaribhāṭṭhapāṭhānam nirākarānavasena visodhitā c’ eva paṭivisodhitā ca hutvā Buddhasāsanamuddanāyantālaye samappitā suṭṭhu muddāpanāy.

This contradicts the information about the manuscripts of the *nikāya-ṭīkās* discussed above (see Part I, Table II). If the Chatthasaṅgāyana edited “all the existing [nikāya] *ṭīkās*” (yā ca tāsam atthappakāsanavasena pavattā ṭīkāyo samvijjanti) “originating from Burma and from outside” (sadesīyamūlehi c’ eva videsīyamūlehi ca samsandityā), why were the manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ and Mp-pt omitted? Further research is needed here.

<sup>283</sup> Modern Pāli scholarship seems to agree to some extent with the Theravāda tradition (i.e. the Chatthasaṅgāyana editions) that most probably only one set of *nikāya-ṭīkās* (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt and Mp-t) still exists at present.

My recent discovery of a manuscript of the old *Ānguttara-ṭīkā*, *Catutthā Līnattha-pakāsinī* (Mp-pt, see Part I, 2.2 and Part II) throws new light on the development of the *nikāya-ṭīkās* and also on the Pāli bibliographic information about them. According to Saddhamma-s (see Part I, 1.1) the old *nikāya-ṭīkās* were “incomplete” (*apariṇūṇa*) and had to be replaced by the later set of *ṭīkās* (*Sāratthamañjūsā*) which were “comprehensive” (*paripūṇa*) and “clear, not confused” (*anākula*). The comparison of three parallel chapters from Mp-pt and Mp-t in Part II, 2 indicates that the description of the old and the later *ṭīkās* in Saddhamma-s is fairly accurate (see Part II, 3). This is a further indication that the information about the two different sets of *nikāya-ṭīkās* in Saddhamma-s is most probably correct.

In the light of the above discussion we can further conclude that the information about the *nikāya-ṭīkās* in all the other Pāli bibliographic sources seems to be less accurate than in Saddhamma-s. Although some of these sources (Pagan inscription, Gv, *Pit-sm* (1989)) mention the old *Ānguttara-ṭīkā* (Mp-pt, see Part I, Table I), none of them mentions two complete sets of *nikāya-ṭīkās* (cf. Part I, Table II).

The information about the *ṭīkās* on the four *nikāyas* in modern Pāli scholarship is mostly based on the Pāli bibliographical works, on the existing printed editions, and rarely also on the catalogues<sup>284</sup> of Pāli manuscripts. Since we have, as shown above, printed editions of only one “combined” set of *nikāya-ṭīkās* (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t), it is often assumed that only one set of *nikāya-ṭīkās* exists at present and that most probably only one complete set was composed. This approach is sometimes also supported by references from the later bibliographic works (e.g. Sās), which are sometimes considered more reliable than the earlier ones (e.g. Saddhamma-s). However, in the case of the two sets of

Cf. Part I, Table II above; *HPL*, p. 167, §357; p. 173, §§375-376; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalaṁgoda: Ānanda Potsamāgama, 1956), Vol. 1, pp. 259-62; Godakumbura 1980, p. xxvii, n. 1.

<sup>284</sup> For example, in Geiger 1956, §31 (literature), nn. 5-6, Fausböll’s “Catalogue of the Madalay MSS. in the India Office Library”, *JPTS* 1894-96, is cited.

*nikāya-tīkās* discussed above — especially considering Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ and Mp-pt, which are usually mentioned as lost or non-existent — the information in the oldest bibliographic source (*Saddhamma-s*) appears to be the most reliable of all (cf. Part I, Tables I-II).

The above analysis of the *nikāya-tīkās* and their manuscripts and printed editions clearly indicates that further research about the Pāli sub-commentaries and their bibliographic information needs to be done. It is possible that more manuscripts of the less known *nikāya-tīkās* (i.e. Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mp-pt) are held in various temple libraries in the Theravāda countries. These *tīkās* are an important link in Pāli textual transmission and their further investigation may give us — among many other things — new information about the development of the *tīkā* literature and about the editions and versions of the canonical and post-canonical Pāli texts used at the time of their compilation.<sup>285</sup>

Primož Pecenko  
Brisbane

<sup>285</sup> I would like to thank Prof. R.F. Gombrich, who read an earlier version of Part I; Mr Michael Carden; L.S. Cousins, Esq.; Ms Tamara Ditrich; Prof. Oskar von Hinüber; Prof. K.R. Norman; Prof. Lily de Silva; and Dr. Royce Wiles, who read the final version of this article, for their helpful suggestions and corrections. Special thanks are also due to U Thaw Kaung, Vice-Chairman, Burmese National Committee for the Preservation of Traditional Manuscripts; Daw Ni Ni Myint, Director General, Universities Historical Research Centre, University of Rangoon; U Nyunt Maung, Manuscript Consultant, Universities Historical Research Centre; U Myint Kyaing, Director, National Library, Rangoon; and the staff of the Universities Historical Research Centre, University of Rangoon, for their generous support during my visit to Burma in December 1999.

I would also like to thank Mr Peter Skilling, Curator, Fragile Palm Leaves project, for sending me a photocopy of a Burmese manuscript of Aṅguttara-tīkā (Mp-ṭ). My thanks are also due to the Department of Studies in Religion, University of Queensland, for continuing support of my research of Pāli texts.

## REFERENCES

Bangchang, Supaphan na. 1981. *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-āṭṭhakathātīkā*. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya.

Bechert, H. 1966. *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft*, Vol. I. Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner.

—, et al. 1979. *Burmese Manuscripts*, Part I. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII, 1. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Braun, H., et al. 1985. *Burmese Manuscripts*, Part II. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII, 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Braun, H., et al. 1996. *Burmese Manuscripts*, Part III. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII, 3. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Buddhadatta, A.P. 1957. "The Second Great Commentator" in *Corrections to Geiger's Mahāvamsa etc.* Ambalangoda: Ananda Book Co., pp. 189–97.

—. 1960. *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō*. Ambalamgoḍa: S. K. Candratiłaka.

—. 1956. 1962. *Pālisāhityaya*, Vols. I and II. Ambalamgoḍa: Ānanda Potsamāgama.

Cœdès, G. 1915. "Note sur les ouvrages pālis composés en pays thai", *BEFEO* XV, 3.

Cousins, LS. 1972. "Dhammadāla and the Tīkā Literature" [review of Sv-pt, ed. by Lily de Silva], *Religion* 2, pt. 1, pp. 159–65.

Dhammaratana Thera, H. 1968. *Buddhism in South India*, The Wheel Publication No. 124/125. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

Fausbøll, V. 1894–96. "Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library (Formerly Part of the King's Library at Mandalay)", *JPTS* IV, pp. 1–52.

Geiger, W. 1956. *Pāli Literature and Language*. Translated by B. Ghosh. 2nd ed. Calcutta.

Godakumbura, C. E. 1980. *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts*. Copenhagen: The Royal Library.

Hazra, K.L. 1982. *History of Theravāda Buddhism in South-East Asia*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

—. 1986. *The Buddhist Annals and Chronicles of South-East Asia*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Jackson, P. 1990. "A Note on Dhammapāla(s)", *JPTS*, Vol. XV, pp. 207–11.

Law, B.C., trans. 1941. *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Lieberman, V.B. 1976. "A New Look at the Sāsanavamsa", *BSOAS* 39.

Lottermoser, F. 1982. *Quoted Verse Passages in the Works of Buddhaghosa: Contributions towards the Study of the Lost Sīhaṭṭhakathā Literature*. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Göttingen.

Luce, G.H., and Tin Htway. 1976. "A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma" in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*. Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee.

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu. 1994. *A Pali–English Glossary of Buddhist Technical Terms*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

Panditha, V. 1973. "Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period" in *The Polonnaruva Period*. Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo.

Pecenko, P. 1997. "Sāriputta and His Works", *JPTS*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 159–79.

Pieris, A. 1978. "The Colophon to the Paramatthamañjūśā and the Discussion on the Date of Ācariya Dhammapāla" in *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*. H. Bechert, ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Ray, Niharranjan. 1946. *An Introduction to the Study of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Raper, T.C.H., and M.J.C. O' Keefe, eds. 1983. *Catalogue of the Pāli Printed Books in the India Office Library*. London: The British Library.

Rhys Davids, T.W. 1882. "List of Pāli, Sinhalese, and Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Colombo Museum", *JPTS* I, pp. 46–49.

—. 1883. "List of Pāli Manuscripts in the Copenhagen Royal Library", *JPTS* I, pp. 147–49.

Silva, W.A. de. 1910–12. "A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters", *JPTS* VI, pp. 133–54.

—. 1938. *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum*. Colombo: Ceylon Government Press.

Sirisena, W.M. 1978. *Sri Lanka and South-East Asia*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Than Tun, U. 1998. "An Original Inscription Dated 10 September 1223 that King Badon Copied on 27 October 1785", *Études birmanes*. Paris: EFEQ.

Thaw Kaung, U. 1998. "Bibliographies Compiled in Myanmar", *Études birmanes*. Paris: EFEQ.

Tseng, Sister H. Vinita. 2001. *The Nidānavagga of the Sāratthappakāsinī*. D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford University, Oriental Studies.

Warder, A.K. 1980. *Indian Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas.

—. 1981. "Some Problems of the Later Pali Literature", *JPTS*, Vol. IX, pp. 198–207.

Wyatt, D.K. 1984. *Thailand, a Short History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations and the quotation system of Pāli sources follow *CPD*, *Epilegomena* to Vol. 1, 1948, pp. 5\*-36\*, and Vol. 3, 1992, pp. ii–vi, and H. Bechert, *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990). The only exception are the PTS editions, which are cited — unless required for emphasis — without edition and date, e.g. Sv-pṭ = Sv-pṭ E<sup>e</sup> 1970, I–III, edited by Lily de Silva. For the transliteration of Burmese see “Table of Transliteration” in Bechert, 1979, p. xxi, and Braun 1996, p. xiii.

A	Āṅguttara-nikāya
B MS(S)	Burmese manuscript(s)
BhB	<i>Bhāratīya Bauddhācāryayā</i> . Colombo: K.M. Ratnasiri, 1949
Bollée	W.B. Bollée. “Die Stellung der Vinayaṭīkās in der Pāli-Literatur”, <i>ZDMG</i> , Suppl. 1, 17 (1969), pp. 824–35.
C MS(S)	Sinhalese manuscript(s)
CPD	<i>Critical Pāli Dictionary</i> . V. Trenckner et al., eds. Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1924–.
CS CD-ROM	<i>Chattha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM</i> (Versions: 1.1, 2.0, 3.0) published by Vipassana Research Institute (Website: < <a href="http://www.vri.dhamma.org">www.vri.dhamma.org</a> >).
D	Dīgha-nikāya
Dhs	Dhammasaṅgaṇī
DPPN	<i>Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names</i>
EncBuddh	<i>Encyclopædia of Buddhism</i> . G.P. Malalasekera, ed.
Gv	Gandhavaṁsa. I.P. Minayeff, ed. <i>JPTS</i> , 1886, pp. 54–79
HIL	J. Gonda, ed. <i>A History of Indian Literature</i> . Wiesbaden, 1973–.
HPL	Oskar von Hinüber. <i>A Handbook of Pāli Literature</i> . Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
K MS(S)	Cambodian manuscript(s)
LPP	K.D. Somadasa. <i>Laṅkāvē puskola pot nāmāvaliya</i> , Vols. I–III. Colombo: Department of Cultural Affairs, 1959–64.
M	Majjhima-nikāya
Mayrhofer,	Manfred Mayrhofer, <i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindo-</i>

EWA	arischen. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1986.
Mhv Trsl.	W. Geiger, tr. <i>Mahāvaṁsa</i> , 1958.
Mp-pṭ	Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇatīkā, Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī.
Mp-ṭ	Manoratha-pūraṇī-purāṇatīkā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā
Piṭ-sm (1989)	<i>Piṭakat samuinh</i> . Rangoon: Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsanā Pru Aphvai, 1989.
PL	K.R. Norman, <i>Pāli Literature</i> . Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.
PLB	M.H. Bode, <i>The Pāli Literature of Burma</i> . London, 1909.
PLC	G.P. Malalasekera, <i>The Pāli Literature of Ceylon</i> . London, 1928.
Ps-pṭ	Papañcasūdanī-purāṇatīkā, Dutiyā Līnatthapakāsinī
Ps-ṭ	Papañcasūdanī-ṭīkā, Dutiyā Sāratthamañjūsā
_r	recto
S	Samyutta-nikāya
Saddhamma-s	Saddhammasaṅgha. Nedimāle Saddhānanda, ed. <i>JPTS</i> 1890, pp. 21–90 = N <sup>e</sup> 1961.
Sās	Sāsanavāṁsa. C.S. Upasak, ed. Nālandā: Nava Nālandā Mahāvihāra, 1961.
Sās-dīp	Sāsanavāṁsadīpo. Vimalasārathera, ed. Colombo: Satthāloka Press, 1880. (For full details of the title, see note 44.)
Spk-pṭ	Sāratthapakāsinī-purāṇatīkā, Tatiyā Līnattha-pakāsinī
Spk-ṭ	Sārattha-pakāsinī-ṭīkā, Tatiyā Sāratthamañjūsā
Sp-ṭ	Samantapāśādikā-ṭīkā (= Sāratthadīpanī)
Sv-nt	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-nada-ṭīkā (= Sādhujana]vilasinī)
Sv-pṭ	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-purāṇatīkā, Paṭhamā Līnatthapakāsinī
Sv-ṭ	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-ṭīkā, Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsā
_v	verso